The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1899.

The Week.

President McKinley was in great form on Friday when he made his speech to the church militant at Ocean Grove. He declared that his policy in the Philippines was:

"Peace first; then, with charity for all, establish a government of law and order, protecting life, property, and occupation, for the well being of the people—a government in which they shall participate under the stars and stripes."

Peace first by means of ten new regiments! Gunpowder and ball with charity for all, and the whole gamut of hypocrisy described by Tacitus in words that have rung through the ages, "Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant"—They make a solitude and call it peace. But what would you do? say the would-be missionaries, Methodist and other, who throw the cloak of religion over this welter of blood. We would do what Admiral Dewey recommended in his interview in the London *Daily News* of August 21, viz.:

"I have never been in favor of violence towards the Filipinos. The islands are at this moment blockaded by a fleet, and war reigns in the interior. This abnormal state of things should cease. I should like to see autonomy first conceded, and then annexation might be talked about. This is my opinion. I should like to see violence at once put a stop to. According to my view, the concession of self-government ought to be the most just and most logical solution."

Those words ought to be printed in letters of gold, and no places would be more fit for their display than the platform of the Auditorium at Ocean Grove and the entrance to the White House at Washington city.

How rapidly the situation in the Philippines changes from week to week, and always against the policy of subjugation, is shown by the news that native mayors, supposed to be in sympathy with the Americans, have been put in jail for conspiring to aid the insurgents. One of them, in fact, is said to hold a Colonel's commission in the Filipino army. Yet it was only two or three months ago that the acceptace of office by these men was trumpeted abroad as a convincing proof of the peaceful spread of American rule. There we were setting up municipal governments. Couldn't the blind anti-imperialists see that the natives hailed our coming, and were glad, as soon as protected from the savage Aguinaldo, to accept our beneficent sway? Well, here are these pet mayors of ours risking their lives to work for Philippine independence. The very men whom President Schurman and the other Philippine Commissioners were pointing to as triumphant evidence of the readiness of the better class to welcome American control, are now shown to have been actively recruiting for the Filipino army. It will not do to dismiss them as treacherous scoundrels. They are our own chosen scoundrels, if scoundrels they are; and if they have tricked us and left us a laughing-stock, that only shows into what perils and pitfalls we have walked.

It is reported from Washington that Gen. Otis has decided to extend to the Philippines the law excluding the Chinese from the United States. What reason exists for such action it is difficult to conjecture. Perhaps the intention is to keep the Chinese at home in order that we may deal with them there. But other nations can get at them in China, while if we let them come to the Philippines we may secure a monopoly of their trade. All accounts agree that the Chinese element is the most tractable that we have to do with, and that it is the most industrious and progressive. Our Government passed the exclusion laws because they were demanded by the people of our Pacific Coast States. The Chinese were pouring in in such numbers as to excite a fear that they would outnumber the whites, and the laboring class was especially violent in its protest against their competition. It is stated that the native Filipinos are also strongly opposed to "Chinese cheap labor," and one of the diplomatic agents of our Government writes from Manila that the exclusion of the Chinese would aid materially in bringing the war to a close. If our Government is reduced to such expedients as this to aid its military operations, the situation is indeed desperate. The Chinese have on all rational grounds a better right to be in Manila than we have. Many thousands of them have long been there. They carry on most of the retail trade, and their influence has been described as valuable by Admiral Dewey. To forbid their immigration is not only to insult the Chinese Government, but is plainly injurious to the prosperity of the Philippines. It seems incredible that so doubtful a measure as this should have been adopted for no better reason than the hope of propitiating malcontent Filipinos; but no other explanation is suggested.

The expenditure for the army during the last two months is said to amount to $30,000,000, or half a million dollars a day. What Congress appropriated for this purpose was not far from $80,000,000, which will be exhausted, at the present rate of outgo, before next December. It is urged that a good deal of this expenditure is on account of contracts that have now been completed. On the other hand, the army is being rapidly increased, and the additional expenditure will be very considerable. Furthermore, the cost of maintaining troops will necessarily be greater this year than last. Nearly all prices have risen, and in some cases the rise has been very great. Possibly Mr. Root may develop such abilities as a war minister as to expel jobbery from the Department; but the task is formidable. Some fifteen months ago, the Government hired two steamers on the Pacific Coast, worth perhaps, $250,000 apiece, at the rent of $1,000 a day, all operating expenses being assumed in addition. After twelve months one of these steamers was returned to the owners, but the other is still retained by the Government, at the same rent. Now that the war is to be prosecuted with renewed vigor, this vessel will probably be kept in service for another year. There is nothing exceptional in such jobs as this. They are necessary incidents of war, and, if the people disapprove of them, they should demand that the war be stopped. On some accounts we are glad to see that the disbursements are at such a rate as will require application to Congress for enlarged appropriations. They will not be granted with the same haste as in the past, and the attention of the people will be called to the price which they are paying for a very doubtful kind of military glory.

Quay met in convention at Harrisburg on Thursday and heartily endorsed Quay. He also had a good word to say for his supporter in the White House. Quay declared himself proud of the Pennsylvania troops. If they are proud of him, the commonwealth is secure. He renewed his promise to the Cramps of a subsidy for the ships they build. Quay resolved that he was for everything that is good for the State and nation, and especially for himself. That is a faithful summary of the so-called Republican State convention at Harrisburg. All accounts agree that there was never a convention in the State so boss-ridden, with the delegates so listless, with nominations and pledges of future nominations so minutely and tyrannically determined in advance. As the free expression of the mind of the party, or even of that of the Quay goods and chattels who composed the convention, it would be ridiculous to take its action and resolutions. The whole thing was simply designed to show that Quay is supreme boss, his power unimpaired by the revelations of last winter, morally damning as they were. It also was designed to show Mr. McKinley that he,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the "great moral earnestness" which Col. Hay has said is his chief characteristic, has done just right in standing by Quay through thick and thin, in spite of the protests of the mind and conscience of the Republican party in Pennsylvania. "Let them kick, Mr. President," is what Quay says in effect; "I will furnish you the delegates just the same."

One searches the Pennsylvania platform in vain for warm approval of the President's Philippine policy. It simply promises him support in "the prosecution of the war," in order that "the supremacy of the flag may be maintained." Not a word about the wisdom of taking the islands, or the desirability of keeping them. In this respect the Pennsylvania Republicans imitate the example of their brethren in Iowa and Kentucky, and even in Ohio. They shy awkwardly at the Philippine issue, and are evidently prepared to bolt and run from it, if political safety seems to lie that way. The Ohio Republicans are heartily in favor of "a wise solution" of the Philippine problem, and, *sotto voce*, wish to heaven they knew what it was. The Kentucky Republicans are going to support Mr. McKinley until he establishes "order and progressive government" in the Philippines, but they evidently wish he would be a little quicker about it. So it goes. A President who does not know his own mind has behind him party leaders who are afraid of their horses.

The demand for iron and steel has so far outstripped the supply that the export of these metals has fallen off and some importations have taken place in lines which are usually abundant at home. Structural iron is in particular demand, but all the mills are filled with orders from four to twelve months ahead. The supply of ore is not equal to the demand. The number of lake vessels fit for carrying ore is likewise deficient. In short, all people seem to want iron at the same time. Now, is not this a favorable time to repeal the duty on iron ore? The revered Dingley put a tax of 40 cents on it, and also on the sea water or other dampness that might be absorbed by it in the course of transit. There is plenty of iron ore in Cuba actually owned by American citizens who cannot get the use of their own property without paying a fine of 40 cents per ton. If this iron ore were obtainable, it would, of course, take the place of some of the manufactured iron which, under the stimulus of the present excessive demand, comes in from abroad over the top of the Dingley tariff.

The merits of the controversy over the advance in the price of beef are not easily determined. There are so many causes in operation as to make it impossible to tell the effect of particular ones, and we may add that so many reckless statements of fact are made as to obscure the whole question. It seems to be undisputed, however, that the price of live cattle in the West has materially advanced. At Omaha, for example, steers are selling for a half more than they have brought in recent years. This disposes of the charge that the recent advance of prices in this city is due to the arbitrary action of the great butchering companies. They have raised the price of meat because they have to pay more for cattle. On the other hand, it is quite probable that their charges were unreasonably high before, and are still unreasonably high. They are protected against competition, except among themselves, by the extent and completeness of their organizations. They have perfected the art of butchering, they have developed the art of utilizing by-products, they have created the art of refrigeration, and they have made an art of transportation. It is obvious that any attempt to compete with such organizations must be on a large scale, must be scientifically planned, and must be very ably managed. Considering the increased demand for meat for exportation, the growth of population, and the ability of the people to pay for meat because of their present prosperity, the general tendency of prices, and the probable shortage in the supply of cattle, it seems doubtful if the butchers of this city can succeed in lowering the cost of beef by their proposed combination.

The Alaska boundary question rises out of the fog and falls back into it with admired regularity, but fails to cause any excitement on this side of the line. The latest thing heard on the other side was that the Canadian Government, despairing of justice from the United States, had resolved to build a railroad on their own territory from some port of their own to the Klondike or to the navigable waters flowing thither. This proposal was quite generally acquiesced in by Americans. At all events no objection could be advanced against it. If Canada can afford to build 700 miles of railroad through a barren country, a road which will have to be operated at a heavy loss, all right. Undoubtedly she can afford it, for she has done such things before when she was much poorer than she is now. Nobody here will lift a finger to prevent her. Yet it would be a pity to waste so much money, and we do not believe that Canada really intends to do so. She already enjoys a right of way across our territory from the head of the Lynn Canal to White Pass. She can send goods in bond from Skagway just as she sends them through Portland, Me., to Montreal, and as we send from Buffalo to Detroit via the Canada Southern Railway. In fact, this bonding privilege is all that she needs commercially. Some little delay, due to formalities, is met with in passing the custom-house, but it is not attended with any expense.

When the goods arrive at White Pass, they cross the Canadian boundary duty free, of course, while American goods taking the same route are subjected to the Canadian tariff before they can reach the Klondike market. This protective tariff, coupled with the railroad, has already killed the town of Dyea and is fast sapping the life of Skagway. These places, while they were outfitting-posts for travel to the Klondike, did a roaring business, but since the White Pass railway has reduced the necessary outfitting to small proportions, the prosperity of the towns on the Lynn Canal has greatly declined, for although goods continue to go through, they do not break bulk; they leave no toll except the wages of freight-handlers. Now, under these circumstances, while the Canadians are making nearly all the profit out of the Klondike trade, and the towns of Dyea and Skagway are either dead or decaying, why should there be so much tail-lashing at Ottawa? Why should Premier Laurier talk about arbitration or war or a new railroad to the Klondike, and why should Sir Charles Tupper tell of his determination to stand by the Government to the last extremity? Evidently, because one of them represents the ins and the other the outs of Canadian politics. They are enjoying now all the profit they could obtain by a new railroad—that is, a virtual monopoly of the Klondike trade. They have everything they could desire except the spectacle of their own flag waving over a port on the Lynn Canal. Facts must prevail in the long run, and this convinces us that a settlement of the boundary question will be reached ere long without either arbitration or war or a new railroad 700 miles long.

The reappearance of M. Labori in the Dreyfus trial, and the mental vigor he has displayed, have already had a considerable influence in changing public opinion as to the result of the trial. It is now evident that the assassin fired at the right man, for in disabling Labori he took out of the court-room the one man whom the prosecution stands most in fear of, the one man who knows most about the case, the one upon whom the defence leans with the greatest confidence. If Labori's strength holds out, the tissue of perjury and forgery which the Court of Cassation partly exposed will be riddled to the satisfaction of the lovers of truth throughout the world. Every dodge, every meanness of the prosecuting witnesses has been con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fronted by Labori with merciless logic, and with indignation of the contagious sort that must have its effect even upon a prejudiced court-martial.

Gen. Mercier is rapidly becoming chief villain of the Dreyfus tragedy, and, luckily, he is meeting the usual dramatic fate of villains in being exposed and overwhelmed with confusion. A whole series of his lies and perjuries was thrown to the ground on Saturday by the testimony of Capt. Freystätter, a member of the court-martial of 1894. The issue of veracity was whether Mercier, then Minister of War, had illegally submitted evidence in secret to the judges, and whether, in particular, he had included the famous Panizzardi dispatch in a translation which he knew to be incorrect. First Mercier denied having done it at all; then asserted that if Col. Sandherr or some other man now dead had sent in the dispatch along with the other documents of the secret dossier, it was in the form which the Foreign Office certified to be correct and which exonerated Dreyfus. But now Capt. Freystätter declares that it was precisely the fraudulent translation of the Italian attaché's dispatch which Gen. Mercier, knowing it to be fraudulent, caused to be read to the judges. This, we suppose, is the basis for the rumor that Mercier himself is to be arrested and court-martialled. His cool audacity did not entirely desert him in the face of Freystätter's revelations. That officer had said something about Dreyfus having been suspected of selling the secret of the Robin shell. An evident lie! cried Mercier, as the Robin shell was not in use before 1895. Will it be believed that Gen. Mercier himself spoke of the same charge against Dreyfus in his testimony of August 11? There it stands in the *Figaro's* stenographic report, the "secret de l'obus Robin." Surely a very shallow as well as a daring villain is this Mercier.

The part which French yellow journalism has had in keeping alive the myths and passions and prejudices which are the only real evidence of Dreyfus's crime, is well brought out by M. Guerlac in his letter in the *Tribune* of Monday. What with clerical organs of slander like the *Croix*, furious anti-Semite papers such as the *Libre Parole*, and the shrieking army-worshipping and foreigner-hating *Petit Journal*, with its circulation of more than 1,000,000, the difficulty of making the truth known in France begins to be seen. It is these newspapers, affirms M. Guerlac, which have fooled the majority of the nation. Even the reports of the present trial they grossly color and pervert. They make out Mercier and Boisdeffre and Gonse national heroes, giving triumphant proofs of Dreyfus's guilt, and represent Col. Picquart as a sneaking driveller, with his face stamped all over with cowardice and duplicity. Take, for example, the way in which the *Petit Journal* treated the attempted assassination of Labori. It almost suppressed mention of the crime, giving to it only a few casual lines. By way of comment, it spoke of the atrocious assault as a "regrettable incident," which "one cannot but condemn, and we do not hesitate to do so"; but then it proceeded to argue that the crime was the very natural retort to the hooting of Mercier by the crowd on the previous Saturday, so that the real fesponsibility lay with the Dreyfusards! It is against such formidable engines of mendacity that the mind and conscience of France have to struggle in their attempt to convert popular opinion.

Mr. Chamberlain's speech about the Transvaal situation on Saturday was disquieting mainly because it showed his impatience and determination to bring matters speedily to a crisis. He complained that Krüger was slow and grudging in all his concessions; that they had to be squeezed out of him like water out of a sponge. What of that? Is that not the usual way of diplomacy? The chief question is whether the concessions are actually made or not. There is every reason to think that Krüger has now conceded all that Sir Alfred Milner demanded. But, as is natural, he wants something in return, and that is, a promise that England will respect the independence of the Transvaal. Why should Mr. Chamberlain refuse this? Only three years ago he said it would be "immoral" for England to interfere in any way with the independence of the Boers. Oom Paul on his side might complain that Chamberlain's demands are always rising; that it is impossible to satisfy him. The situation is unquestionably grave, more so through Parliament not being in session; but we still believe that Lord Salisbury will restrain "pushful Joe," and not allow him to plunge Great Britain into a needless war. Meanwhile, both sides are pushing forward their preparations for the final struggle.

In view of the complaints made by the British Government of the oppression of its subjects in the Transvaal Republic, it should be observed that only white men's rights are considered. The natives of British India are subjects of the Empress Victoria, but they do not have the rights of English citizens. They have no political rights, and their legal rights are limited. The Legislature of Natal has taken measures to exclude their Indian fellow-subjects from that colony. It has levied a capitation tax on them, which is quite as oppressive as the tax levied on the Outlanders by the Boers. The Dominion of Canada imposes a tax of $50 on every Chinaman that enters that country, and British Columbia has lately tried to keep out the Japanese. It seems that the Japanese have been pouring into that province at an alarming rate, with the usual resulto of furnishing "Asiatic cheap labor," and when they have established themselves they show no disposition to go away. What is most startling is the fact that the Japanese Government has had the impudence to suggest that, after a certain period of residence, the Japanese in British Columbia should be given the franchise. The Dominion Government has been obliged to veto the exclusion law of Columbia, and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain is reported to have suggested that the Natal act might be copied. To this the Columbian authorities reply that the Japanese Government would probably regard that as an unfriendly proceeding, and the problem remains unsettled. Evidently the admission of Japan to the status of a civilized Power may have awkward consequences. It implies that the Japanese are on a level with white people, and must be treated like the subjects of the European states. To refuse them the franchise in the Dominion of Canada, after the claims that Great Britain has made for the Outlanders in the Transvaal, may have an air of inconsistency which cannot easily be explained away.

Emperor William has again run up against that ridiculous provision of the law which compels him to ask money of a popular assembly. When he opened the Dortmund-Ems canal some three weeks ago, he broadly hinted to the Prussian Diet that he expected a prompt vote of the money necessary to complete a system of waterways stretching right across Germany, and connecting the Rhine, the Weser, the Elbe, the Oder, and the Vistula. But the refractory Diet refused the grant by large majorities. It was those stout and consistent Protectionists, the Agrarians, who did the mischief. They do not want improved internal communications which would simply increase the facilities for bringing in foreign agricultural products and foreign timber. To them, the opinion of a British vice-consul that the Dortmund-Ems canal would be "distinctly favorable to British shipping," was enough to condemn all such projects. So they braved the wrath of the Emperor, and flatly refused him his money. That potentate is in a fury, and is calling his Cabinet to task for having allowed such a rebuff to fall upon him. But dismissing a Minister or two will not go to the root of the trouble. It ought to be made treason to deny the Emperor any sums he may demand, and the whole Diet should be drowned in the canal. Their successors would then be more reasonable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRUTH IS NOT IN HIM.

Mr. McKinley has broken his long silence on the Philippine question. He has also broken something else, as we shall proceed to show. What he asserted in his speech at Pittsburgh on Monday is doubtless what he would like to believe to be true, but the facts are otherwise. We shall set forth as dispassionately as possible some of Mr. McKinley's perversions of the truth.

To begin with, he said:

> "Until the treaty was ratified we had no authority beyond Manila city, bay, and harbor. We then had no other title to defend, no authority beyond that to maintain. Spain was still in possession of the remainder of the archipelago. Spain had sued for peace. The truce and treaty were not concluded."

Very good; then by what title or authority did William McKinley assert on December 21, 1898, seven weeks before the treaty was ratified, sovereignty over all the Philippine Islands? In his proclamation of that date he declared that "with the *signature* of the treaty of peace . . . the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands *are ceded* to the United States." He went on to announce that, "in fulfilment of the rights of sovereignty *thus acquired*," he proposed to immediately occupy and administer "the *entire group* of the Philippine Islands." In other words, what the President now says he could not do legally, he did do. Boasting now that "every step taken was in obedience to the requirements of the Constitution," he compels attention to the fact that his proclamation of December 21, 1898, was in flat violation of the Constitution. If he could, as he then asserted, proceed to occupy and administer the entire group, then his excuse for doing nothing outside of Manila falls to the ground. If, as he now says, it would have been illegal to assert title to the islands before the treaty was ratified, then he is a confessed law-breaker, for such title he did assert. We prefer (to quote his own language) to "leave to others the ungracious task of justification and eulogy."

Mr. McKinley declared further that his purpose in originally sending troops to Manila was to "emancipate" the natives, and that, therefore, they should have been our "firmest friends." Well, it was not the fault of the Filipinos that eternal friendship was not sworn on the spot. They were for months most profuse in their expressions of gratitude and admiration and attachment. If ever a statesman had an easy task, it was that of consolidating the amity which existed for months at Manila between Filipinos and Americans. But all was turned to bitterness and hatred. Why? Because the Filipinos discovered that, whatever might be the case with Dewey and the other officers on the scene, the Government at Washington was insincere in its fair words. This is not a matter of opinion. There is an official document on record which shows how hollow are these later pretences of an intention to "emancipate" the Filipinos. As early as June 16, 1898, the Secretary of State, Judge Day, wrote a letter to Consul Pratt in which the real purpose of this Government respecting the natives was revealed. Warning the Consul against having any relations with the Filipino leaders, Mr. Day said: "This Government has known the Philippine insurgents only as discontented and rebellious subjects of Spain"; and went on: "The United States, in entering upon the occupation of the islands, . . . will expect from the inhabitants . . . that obedience which will be lawfully due from them." There is the announced purpose of the McKinley Administration a month and a half after Dewey's victory—the islands to be seized, the natives to be subdued.

The President's most unblushing distortion of the truth was his assertion that it is only "the will of one man" that keeps the Filipinos from submitting, and that the insurgents "in no sense represent the sentiment of the people." This is antecedently incredible, and it also flies in the face of a mass of evidence to the contrary which is simply overwhelming. Not alone newspaper representatives, but army officers and commanders of our ships, report the situation of our troops in the islands as that of besieged men. If ever there was proof that a foreign invasion was dashing itself against a strong and rising national sentiment, we have that proof in the Philippines. Napoleon did not find it more marked in Spain or Russia. In the very newspapers containing the President's speech are dispatches from a trusted Philippine correspondent, saying, "The only friendly natives I found on my southern tour were the Moros [Mr. McKinley's polygamous and slaveholding protégés]. Even the non-combatants hate us. In Manila the native feeling against us is growing stronger every day." And the same day we get the testimony of the Rev. Peter MacQueen, long in the islands as chaplain of the First California volunteers, to the following effect:

> "There is not a Filipino in the islands that wants the American form of government. There was a time when the conquest of the islands might have been completed with comparatively little bloodshed, and that was immediately after Dewey's victory. Since that time the policy has been such as to encourage resistance."

We are content to leave the President's assertions and the facts to confront each other. But we are heartily glad he has spoken out. He has now committed himself to the policy of subjugation. He has staked his political fortunes on the popularity with Americans of a merciless war upon millions of men of another race, half way round the globe, who resent and repudiate our pretensions to rule over them. Unless the country we have known and loved has suddenly become a cruel nation of conquerors, the ultimate fate of such a President and such a policy cannot be in doubt.

RECOGNIZING SLAVERY.

The *Tribune* of Friday morning contained an editorial article pointing out that, muddled and scarcely intelligible as a large part of the charter of New York is, the provision that no president of a borough shall have a vote in the Board of Public Improvements except upon matters relating exclusively to his own borough "is absolutely lucid, yields its full meaning at a single glance, and is incapable of supporting the claim based upon it under any torture." The *Tribune* adds:

> "If it can be held to mean that the borough presidents can vote on the water scheme, then the provision making the Mayor's term four years may as well be held to mean that the Mayor's term is two years or five, and article xiii. of the Federal Constitution be construed as permitting slavery to exist in any part of the United States."

On another page the *Tribune* published the Associated Press dispatch from Manila, which announced that Gen. Bates had returned there from Sulu, having succeeded, "after five weeks' negotiation with much tact," in securing the signing of an agreement with the Sultan of the Moros. By this agreement American sovereignty over the Moros is recognized, and the United States may occupy and control "such parts of the archipelago as public interest demands." The Americans are to continue paying the Sultan the same subsidy which he got from Spain; the Americans are to protect the Moros against foreign imposition; American courts are to have jurisdiction, "except between the Moros"; the introduction of firearms shall be prohibited, piracy shall be suppressed, and there shall be no persecution on account of religion.

"Domestic institutions" among the Moros are not disturbed. One of these institutions is slavery. Mr. John Foreman, in his 'Philippine Islands,' says on this point:

> "The Mussulmans (called by the Spaniards Moros) now extend over the whole of Mindanao Island, and the sultanate of Sulu, which comprises Sulu Island and about 140 others, 80 to 90 of which are uninhabited. Slavery exists in a most ample sense. There are slaves by birth, and others by conquest, such as prisoners of war, insolvent debtors, and those seized by piratical expeditions to other islands."

Prof. Dean C. Worcester, now a member of the Philippine Commission, in his 'Philippine Islands,' says:

> "We soon found that the slave business still flourished in Tawi Tawi. Girls of fifteen years were valued at three *cabans* (about five bushels) of rice. One was offered to us at Tataän for three dollars in cash. The proposition was a secret one, for while Don Felipé [the Spanish commander] could not control the Moros on the south coast, he would have no slave-catching or selling about his corner of the island. He told us that the slave-dealers had no difficulty in selling all the able-bodied men they could

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capture to the Dutch planters in Borneo—a fact which affords one more illustration of the benefits that civilization sometimes brings to a benighted land!"

The thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States declares that "neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, *or any place subject to their jurisdiction.*" It is an interesting fact that the amendment, as originally introduced by Senator Henderson of Missouri, provided that slavery or involuntary servitude "shall not exist in the United States." The Judiciary Committee, through its chairman, Senator Trumbull of Illinois, reported it back with a change in the form of the prohibition, and the addition, after "the United States," of the words, "or any place subject to their jurisdiction." In presenting the revised draft to the Senate on the 28th of March, 1864, Mr. Trumbull emphasized this point:

"It is a proposition so to amend the Constitution of the United States as *for ever to prohibit slavery within its jurisdiction.*"

The United States in 1864 possessed no "place subject to their jurisdiction" outside the bounds of the States, Territories, and District of Columbia, which constituted the Union. A prohibition of slavery "in the United States" would have prevented its existence wherever our government had jurisdiction. But the opposition to the "peculiar institution" was so earnest, and the determination that this government should never again lend any favor to it was so strong, that the Republican leaders decided to cover all possible contingencies in the indefinite future. They therefore so amended the Constitution that if the nation should afterwards, as it did only three years later, acquire Alaska, there should be no danger of slavery existing there, and that in whatever remote corner of the world the flag of the republic should ever wave, the mere fact that the United States held jurisdiction should of itself mean freedom to all the inhabitants. As the *Tribune* says of the clause in the New York charter regarding the voting power of a borough president in the Board of Public Improvements, the language of the amendment "is absolutely lucid, yields its full meaning at a single glance."

The idea that the thirteenth amendment might be construed as permitting slavery to exist anywhere that the United States government holds jurisdiction rightly seemed to the writer of the *Tribune* article unthinkable. Yet that is precisely what the McKinley Administration is doing. The government of the United States is to exercise sovereignty over the Moros, and at the same time it is to allow the continuance of slavery in this "place subject to their jurisdiction." The war with Spain was begun "in the cause of humanity," and "for the sake of freeing the oppressed." The latest development in the train of events which has followed is this proposition of the McKinley Administration to construe the thirteenth amendment as permitting slavery to exist under the jurisdiction of the United States. What do the clergy, the religious organizations, the missionary societies think of this?

PHASES OF THE NEGRO PROBLEM.

During the past week the war in the Philippines has been thrust somewhat into the background by the news from the nearer conflict between whites and blacks in the State of Georgia. About ten days ago, Henry Delegal, a black politician of Darien, Ga, made an assault on a white woman—or was charged with having made such an assault. Delegal was soon arrested. The negroes conceived the idea that he was to be lynched —"falsely conceived" the idea, the whites say, but not unnaturally, any candid observer must admit. When the Sheriff started on Wednesday to remove Delegal from Darien to Savannah for safe-keeping, "the negroes dropped everything to go to his rescue," and surrounded the jail. The Sheriff appealed to the Governor for aid, and 200 militiamen were sent from Savannah. Arrests of black rioters were then made by the dozen.

Two of Delegal's sons "were badly wanted," and two white deputy-sheriffs went after them. They apparently submitted to arrest, and then fired upon the sheriffs, one of whom was wounded by John Delegal and soon died, while the other was threatened with instant death by a crowd of negroes, and had a narrow escape. Of course, this intensified the excitement. The negroes practically deserted Darien and took to the swamps. They threw out pickets and sent in word that they would not submit to arrest. The whites sent to every convict camp in the State for bloodhounds, dispatched an armed posse on horseback to the scene of the trouble, organized another posse to go by special train, and sent a steamer to Brunswick to bring as many volunteers as could be secured. Early Saturday morning operations began. Every negro found as the white forces advanced was arrested. Women and children, as well as men, were placed under guard to prevent information from being carried across the country to the eight cabins, which had been the Delegal stronghold. The cabins were searched without result, and then "the swamps were being beaten closely while the soldiers lined out on the bluffs, prepared to send a volley into the negroes as they came before the posse," when Henry Delegal's aged mother came out and arranged for his surrender. He was lodged in jail at Darien on Saturday night, and there was at once "a noticeable decrease of negro talk; the surrender of Delegal and the arrival of additional troops having completely unnerved those in Darien." On Sunday it was thought prudent to send home some of the troops, while the rest remained in camp until after the special term of court to try Henry Delegal, John Delegal, and thirty-five black rioters. But the country is still thoroughly alarmed.

Meanwhile, there have been interesting developments in the relations between the two races in the neighboring State of Florida. A white politician named Crum was recently appointed postmaster at Peck, Fla., and took a negro for his clerk. Last week a party of "whitecaps" violently attacked Crum, whipped him cruelly, and poured carbolic acid upon the lacerated flesh. He is still confined to his bed and suffering terribly. The colored deputy has fled from the neighborhood in fear of his life. The Federal Government immediately ordered the discontinuance of the post-office, and offered a reward of $200 each for the apprehension of the guilty persons. This caused great indignation among the whites. Two post-office inspectors who went to Peck have not returned. It is reported that the residents will not allow them to leave, and fears for their safety are entertained. The United States District Attorney, with six deputy marshals from Jacksonville, went to Peck on Saturday night with warrants for the arrest of sixteen whitecaps, took the town by surprise, and bagged seven without resistance. When they went back on Sunday for the rest, armed guards along the road tried to stop them, though without success; but armed men have since been on the alert throughout the neighborhood, determined to prevent the arrest of any more of their people. The officers sent for reinforcements, and propose to execute the rest of the warrants at all hazards.

In the State of South Carolina a new aspect of the trouble between whites and blacks has developed. A number of outrages were recently committed upon negroes at Greenwood, S. C., by whitecaps. The blacks had committed no crime, and had not tried to hold even so petty an office as a clerkship. The only trouble was that they live more cheaply than the whites. It is a region where land-owners rent their holdings largely to tenants. Of course, they want to get the largest possible returns. The small white farmers find that the blacks, whose standards of comfort and expenditure are pitched on a lower scale, can afford to offer a higher rental, and they are thus pushing the whites out of the most productive land. The whites have consequently taken to whipping the blacks by night, in the hope of frightening them away.

Here are three phases of the race problem presented almost simultaneous-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly in three adjoining States in the "black belt." Any one of them alone, because typical of conditions that exist widely, would seem alarming enough to engage the most thoughtful Americans. But, in point of fact, few people have time to give them any attention, so engrossed is the nation with the efforts of the Administration to thrust "benevolent assimilation" upon an unwilling race of colored men on the other side of the globe.

OUR OWN ANTI-DREYFUSISM.

We have been working ourselves up in this country to a fine pitch of virtuous complacency over the Dreyfus case. France seems to us so wrong, so possessed, so driven by passion and ridden by panic fears, that we cannot but have a better idea of ourselves by comparison. We not only feel vastly superior to Frenchmen, as they display themselves in this affair, but we wish earnestly to manifest to them our moral disapproval. We even talk of morally boycotting them. We will avoid them. We will keep away from their Exposition. America will gather up her skirts and, as she passes by disdainfully, let her soiled French sister see what real virtue and moral indignation mean.

Now, it is always ungracious to disturb the peace of mind of people thanking God that they are not as other men are; but it is sometimes necessary and salutary to do so. Indeed, we have not only Scriptural warrant (which might not be enough), but good Republican precedent, for saying something unpleasant to "holier-than-thou" folk; and to our mind there is a good deal of rank Pharisaism and hypocrisy, none the less offensive for being partly unconscious, in the present attitude of many Americans towards France and the French people. We believe, and are glad and proud to assert, that the instinctive regard of Americans for individual justice, and for the rights of an accused man before the law, would make the Dreyfus tragedy impossible in this country. But we also believe that in some of the deeper-lying passions and motives which account for the horrible injustice done Capt. Dreyfus, we are not so different from the French as we plume ourselves upon being. In fact, if we look closely into the matter, we shall find it too true of many of us that wherein we judge the French we condemn ourselves.

What, in the last analysis, is the reason why France has apparently gone mad about Dreyfus? It is because the nation has come to have an insane devotion to the army. In the military power it has come to feel that its strength and safety are bound up. Anything that touches or seems to touch the credit or efficiency of the army drives a Frenchman into a frenzy. The nation is for the army, not the army for the nation; and it is with a fierce energy as of self-preservation that the French rush blindly to crush any one who seems to be attacking the army. It is upon this feeling, almost amounting to mania, that the conspirators against Dreyfus have artfully played. But are we wholly innocent of any such national delusion? Have we no public men who exalt the military arm as the nation's true grandeur? In our execration of the wrongs of Dreyfus, we must not forget that every man among us who asserts might over right, who advances the doctrine that our country's hope is in the army and navy, and that the Commander-in-Chief can do no wrong, is by so much revealing himself an anti-Dreyfusard. Theodore Roosevelt took occasion in one of his recent speeches to point to the awful exhibition France was making before the civilized world. We beg to tell him that it is of just such ideas as his own about the supreme importance of the army, and the glorification of the military life, that France is perishing.

Another point in which we at this moment are "deplorably like" the French, is our persistent unwillingness to admit that we have made a mistake. It is safe to say that the judgment of the civilized world is as unanimous in the opinion that our policy in the Philippines has been a huge blunder as it is in the opinion that Dreyfus was unjustly condemned. We say nothing now of the larger question of expansion—let that be as it may; it is certain that our handling of the situation in the Philippines has been one long mistake and misery. But are we going to admit it? Never! Our anti-Dreyfusards are as fierce about it as their French brothers were against revision. We, too, have our *chose jugée*. If we perhaps did blunder in our attitude towards the Filipinos, our dignity as a nation will not allow us to reconsider and reverse it. No, we say, we have made our decision, and it is irrevocable. But this is pure anti-Dreyfusism.

Finally, let us look in the French mirror and see if we do not recognize familiar features in the furious outcry with which Picquart and Scheurer-Kestner and Pressensé and Bréal and Stapfer and Seignobos, and the few brave men who dared to tell the French nation that a grievous wrong had been done, were pursued by press and public. Is there any analogy between the sneers with which these "intellectuels" were denounced, and the taunt of "doctrinaires" which Gov. Roosevelt hurls at *our* professors and publicists who ask that the country be just and conciliatory, instead of truculent, in the Philippines? Alas, alas, we are all poor mortals, and there is nothing so like an inflated and besotted Frenchman as an inflated and besotted American. We only hope that our moral indignation will not be exported for the use of the absent and foreigners—the two great classes of human beings who are always wrong—to the point of sweeping bare the home market. We think we foresee a large domestic demand for the article in the near future, and advise those who are using up all their reserve stock of horror and shame in denouncing the anti-Dreyfusites of France, not to put the United States in the humiliating position of being obliged to ask Frenchmen to send us some back when we need it most.

AMERICANS AND GERMANS.

Whatever tends to promote friendship between the different peoples of the earth is to be welcomed, and Prof. Münsterberg's article in the September number of the *Atlantic*, entitled "The Germans and the Americans," is full of friendly professions. For many reasons, however, we apprehend that the article will fail to remove such misunderstandings as now exist, even if it does not add to their number. It specifies many particulars in which German theories, prejudices, and habits differ from those of Americans. It explains why Germans who have long been citizens of the United States are a socially isolated class, even if we do not admit that the average German-American stands below the level of the average German at home. It advances certain theories and speculations, more or less suggestive and meritorious, concerning the psychological constitution of Americans, and it would be ungracious to deny that it accords us a generous meed of praise.

Nevertheless, the reasoning of the article is fallacious. It assumes that what is true of some is true of all. The population of the United States is made up of many races, and when Prof. Münsterberg speaks of what Americans believe or like, we have to ask what he means. The Irish Americans have their own feelings, and so have the German, the Scandinavian, the Russian, the French, the Italian, even the Jewish elements. There are Africans and Asiatics with prejudices of their own, and there are marked differences between the native Americans of the South and those of the North; nor are the latter to be classed as homogeneous. Speaking broadly, the people of every race dislike and dread or despise the people of every other race. As Cicero observed, the same word means stranger and enemy. Granting Prof. Münsterberg's sweeping assertion, which is that the two peoples do not like each other, let us ask, What peoples do like each other? Can he name any people that love the Germans? Are the French fond of them? or the Danes? or the Poles? or the Russians? or the English? Do the non-German Austrians love their German fellow-citizens? Do the Bavarians, even, love the Prussians? and have the Germans any sincere liking for any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG.
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these peoples that do not like them?

Prof. Münsterberg recounts many dissimilarities between Germans and Americans which are amply sufficient to arouse dislikes; but any foreigner of equal ability could do the same for his own race. When a distinguished German is presented to one of our leading statesmen and finds him squirting tobacco-juice on the floor, or even into a spittoon, he does not like it. Neither does a well-bred Englishman or Frenchman. Tastes differ. It is idle to argue about them, still more idle to imagine that one people will give up its habits to please another. The descendants of the Puritans, who are probably the people that Prof. Münsterberg has in mind when he generalizes about Americans, do not like the ways of Germans, and probably never will. Perhaps, it is better that they never should. They come of an ascetic stock. They seriously think that the Germans have accomplished the desecration of the Sabbath and the subversion of the cause of temperance. They have accepted their music, with due deliberation, but they are not reconciled to their dancing and beer-drinking. But that the American people as a body have any peculiar aversion to the Germans, is not established by anything that Prof. Münsterberg advances.

It is an altogether different matter when we come to consider Prof. Münsterberg's glorification of what he calls Germany, but which is really a medley of political and social misrepresentations. He sneers at the German-Americans because they protested against the "Anglo-American Alliance," and entirely ignores the fact that this was by way of protest against imperialism. He is an enthusiastic imperialist, and, no doubt, is disturbed that his fellow-countrymen are unanimously opposed to him; but that is no excuse for not doing justice to their attitude. Equally misleading is his account of Germany. We may concede that "there is no people under the sun with more valuable inner freedom than the Germans." "Inner" freedom is not easily suppressed, but when we are assured that "the German University is the freest place on earth," we can but stare and gasp. There was a Liberal Member of Parliament named Virchow, who was also not unknown as a professor at the University of Berlin. How did the Government treat him? What sort of treatment did Mommsen receive under Bismarck? What course was taken with Prof. Geffcken when he published the diary of the Crown Prince? How came Georg von Bunsen to be prosecuted? What is the explanation of these recent attacks on professors who have taken the part of the Social Democrats? What of Prof. Delbrück's fine?

Even as regards the outer forms of freedom, Prof. Münsterberg maintains, Germany is freer than the United States. Comparisons are odious. Many outrageous infractions of liberty take place here, and we are at present in no mood for boasting. But that is the very reason why we must protest against other unfounded claims. Prof. Münsterberg says the right to insult the President is not freedom. That begs the question. Is it freedom when an editor is sent to prison for four months for commenting on the Emperor's speech at the opening of Parliament? The numberless prosecutions for *lèse-majesté* are not to be brushed away with a metaphysical definition. Prof. Münsterberg says that he is a monarchist, and calmly assumes that the present revival of mediæval pretensions by the Emperor is monarchy. He is welcome to his opinion, but until he can silence the voices of the German Liberals and of an immense number of German voters, he has no right to make such representations to the American people. Few intelligent Americans have any objection to a constitutional monarchy. It is impossible for us, but we might be better off if we had it. We will not go so far as to say that few intelligent Germans favor the recent developments of imperialism in that country, but we know that a great many do not; and they are by race and position quite as well qualified to speak as Prof. Münsterberg.

Take the case of the German colonies, for instance. "The colonial transmarine development of the German empire is taking away that narrowness of its citizens which too much depressed the spirit of individual initiative." As a matter of fact, two or three thousand Germans a year may be induced to settle in these colonies, after twenty years of Government support, at a cost to their countrymen of about 100,000 marks per colonist. How is individual initiative thereby relieved from depression, and how is it related to the disposition of Germans to colonize anywhere rather than under their own flag? Prof. Münsterberg is delighted with the Spanish war and our new policy of conquest. He says that "an heroic revival is at hand, imperialism awakens echoes throughout the land"; and hints that we shall best approximate to the true ideals illustrated in the German Emperor by becoming an aristocracy and putting our government in charge of a Cæsar.

That is the theory in the minds of a certain class, in this country, in Germany, and elsewhere. It is the theory of reaction, of servility, of despotism. The *Titelsucht* which is corrupting the German empire goes with it; the ignoble desire to be promoted by the ruling powers into an arbitrary social prominence without reference to intrinsic worth. Such is not the theory of those Germans and those Americans whose political ideal is liberty, and whose effort is to make free from the oppression of its rulers. One of the best of men and ablest of German statesmen, Bamberger, declared just before he died that the conduct of our Government in the Spanish war had put back the cause of Liberal progress in the Old World a hundred years. To put back what Bamberger called the cause of liberal progress is exactly what Prof. Münsterberg would like to do, and if his ideal is to prevail, Germany will be detested by every American who loves the constitution established by his fathers. There is eternal hostility between the ideals of freedom and of despotism. If the governments of Germany and the United States are to be free governments, there will be no need of reconciling Germans and Americans. They will have no disputes over naval superiority, or colonies, or tariffs. If not, no likeness between the peoples will prevent conceited and ambitious rulers from quarrelling.

VAMPIRES.

AMHERST, August, 1899.

Some years ago the writer, accompanied by a friend, was travelling on foot in Greece. One day, after sunset, we reached an isolated farmhouse, situated on the edge of what was then the great Copaic morass, immediately north of Orchomenus. We had been tramping through Greece for seven weeks; we were very footsore, and a long walk had made us unusually tired and hungry on that particular day. As we approached the house, we were greeted by the barking of a huge, and apparently very savage, dog, who made frantic efforts to break his chain in order to gratify his burning curiosity in regard to the two forlorn travellers. Had we known what was to follow, the dog would have inspired us with more respect, but we had seen many Grecian curs masquerading as lions, though at heart they were as cowardly as hares. So, trusting to knowledge born of experience with other dogs, we scarcely deigned to notice the vigorous protests of this savage beast. Arrived at the door of the farmhouse, we knocked once and again. Apparently the house had no inmate. But after a time the door opened cautiously, and a burly Albanian peasant appeared in the doorway extending towards us a pair of tongs in which was held a live coal of fire. The extraordinary performance rendered us for the moment speechless with astonishment. The peasant, pale and apparently quivering with terror, stood but for a moment holding the coal of fire towards us. Then, without having uttered one word, he hastily closed the door in our faces and bolted it with care.

This behavior was as inexplicable to us at the time as it is, no doubt, to the reader now. But at any rate one thing was certain: the man had given us the strongest assurance that he regarded our room as better than our company. We were confronted by a condition, not a theory; we were literally worn out; we knew that the nearest village was about five miles distant; it was now dark, and we longed to be housed and fed. So we knocked at the door again, and yet again, but all within was as silent as the grave, in striking contrast with the deep-voiced bellowings of the dog behind us. But our friend of the tongs could not be in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duced to come forth a second time and parley with us. Finally, we gave up in despair, and, wandering away past the uproarious cur, we sat down in sadness upon a neighboring bank to determine what was to be done under the distressing circumstances. To our great relief, we soon descried a half-grown boy approaching on a donkey, but to our queries as to the possibility of finding lodging for the night in the house he answered with a decided No, stating that he was the only Greek on the premises, and that the inmates were Albanians who were in no wise likely to entertain strangers. "But," said he, pointing to a hut of considerable size, "there is the dog's house. You can sleep there if you want to. But they always turn the dog loose at night, and if he finds you, he will eat you up, as sure as fate." Thus saying, he left us to confront an unameliorated condition: the door of the house opened to allow him to enter, but was closed and ostentatiously bolted after him.

In the course of our wanderings we had frequently been compelled to spend the night in the open air as best we might, but on former occasions we were not so tired, footsore, and hungry as we were on that particular evening. It was, therefore, a real hardship to be treated with a rude inhospitality that was wholly inexplicable to us, because, hitherto, we had received not merely hospitality, but marked attention even. However, under the circumstances, the only thing left for us to do was to take possession of the dog's house as the sole protection within our reach against the chilling dews of a Grecian spring night. That dog was something of an aristocrat, and his house was a veritable palace—for a dog; better, indeed, than many houses that are occupied by human beings. Upon entering we found, to our great regret, that the door was off its hinges, and, in spite of anxious effort, we could not adjust it in the pitchy darkness. The dog had been set free, and was now rampant, roaming to and fro and calling for our blood, with deep-mouthed bellowings that gave us concern, as I am free to confess. Taking all things into consideration, we had come to respect the dog, and it was with pain that we realized that we could not debar him from impertinent intrusion upon our privacy. We propped the door up, but, had the powerful dog so wished, he could have entered without difficulty. In our unarmed condition, therefore, we were not wholly free from anxiety lest he might find an opportunity to eat us, according to the reassuring prophecy of the Greek boy.

But weariness bore heavily upon us, and, yielding to necessity, we laid us down, just as we were, in the dust that was ankle deep, and of that peculiar liquid variety produced by the action of innumerable tramplings. The whole night through, the dog never once ceased his search for us; we could hear him now near at hand and now in the distance, but ever making night hideous with his bayings, which did not have for us the soothing, nerve-calming effect upon which Byron dwells. We had been reading that poet as we journeyed through Greece, and we were keenly alive to the irony of the words:

> "'Tis sweet to hear the watch-dog's honest bark
> Bay deep-mouthed welcome as we draw near home."

Fortunately for us, it did not occur to the dog to look for us in his own house, though he often came uncomfortably near, and so we dragged through the weary night without a visit from our canine friend, of whom, by this time, we stood in absolute terror.

We arose at the peep of day, selecting for our exit a moment when the dog seemed to be baying in the distance, and attempted to gain the open country before he could discover us. Vain delusion, for we had not taken many steps before the dog became aware of that for which he had been searching fruitlessly the entire night, and made for us with the speed of the wind. His faithful, all-night hunt deserved to be crowned with success, but he was doomed to disappointment—at the very moment, too, when he had treed his game. Fortunately for us an inmate of the house was astir even before us, and, throwing himself upon the furious beast as he rushed past, he bore him to the ground and held him there. From the time of St. Paul down to the present day everybody in Greece has been inquisitive. Under the circumstances, the curiosity of our benefactor was natural enough, but still it was ridiculous in the extreme to see him lie there on the furious, struggling, howling dog, and ply us with a host of questions, many of which were wholly irrelevant. When finally he had satisfied his curiosity, he apologized for the treatment we had received at the hands of the rude Albanians, and bade us go—in God's name. We were not slow to obey, nor did we stop to satisfy our own curiosity as to how he came to be there in his peculiar garb, for he was stark naked.

In Greece the belief in vampires was once widespread, but it has been gradually dying away as education invades the remoter recesses of the land. Even in Athens one still sometimes hears: "May the vampire take you!"—a curse of diabolical nature. But the belief in vampires is now confined to the lower classes, and perhaps chiefly to the Albanians, of whom Von Halm relates that they entertain many other absurd superstitions, such as belief in the existence of men with tails—no doubt a reminiscence of the Satyr of classical mythology. Among us most people have but a vague and indefinite idea in regard to the vampire, his *raison d'être*, his haunts and habits. It seems that after death some people do not rest quietly in their graves, but come forth at night when the moon shines. They live by sucking the blood of men, and return to their tombs at the approach of dawn, after gorging themselves with human blood. There are two kinds of vampires: the blood-sucking and a less malignant variety. It is of the malignant vampire that Byron speaks when he writes:

> "But first, on earth, as vampire sent,
> Thy corse shall from its tomb be rent:
> Then ghastly haunt thy native place,
> And suck the blood of all thy race."

The less malignant type of vampire amuses itself by playing tricks on people and by frightening them, but otherwise does them no harm. The more malignant vampire, on the contrary, is fond of the liver of its victims, whom it attacks in the form of a variety of animals or insects, such as cats, dogs, fleas, spiders, etc.

The best evidence that death has been caused by a vampire is the mark of a bite on the nape of the neck, though sudden death of any kind is regarded as its work. The fear of sudden death is said to be very great among the peoples with whom the vampire loves to dwell, for the reason that he who has been killed by a vampire himself becomes one. Allatius tells us that the vampire is not the soul of the deceased, but an evil spirit which enters the body of the dead person. He says:

"The corpse is entered by a demon, which is the source of ruin to unhappy men. For frequently, emerging from the tomb in the form of that body, and roaming about the city and other inhabited places, especially by night, *it betakes itself to any house it fancies, and, after knocking at the door, addresses one of its inmates in a loud tone. If the person answers he is done for. If he does not answer he is safe.* In consequence of this, the people of the island of Chios never reply the first time, if any one calls them by night."

Fire is the surest protection against vampires. Behold, then, the key to the treatment to which we were subjected by the Albanian peasant. The poor creature had mistaken us for vampires. We did not discover this fact until after our return to Athens, when some friends, to whom we recounted our strange adventure, opened our eyes. We had not seen a vampire ourselves, but the Albanian saw two, and trembled.

It is a fearful thing to become a vampire, and people whose friends have died are always anxious to gain some certain knowledge as to the status of their beloved dead. The question, "How fares it with the spirit of my dead mother, father, husband, wife?" is a momentous one even to this day. In many places it is still customary to disinter the corpse after it has lain for a year in the grave, in order to solve the question as to whether the soul of the dead be in heaven or hell. I believe that this custom had its origin in the vampire faith, though I am not prepared to say that the vampire superstition is nowadays the confessed cause of the exhumation. The condition of the bones decides whether or no the spirit is in heaven or hell, but if the body be found in a good state of preservation, with the skin taut like a drum, then the dead person has become a vampire.

There are various causes for the change into a vampire after death. Chief among them is excommunication by Holy Mother Church, then great sins of any kind, the curse of parents, dealings with witches and witchcraft, eating the flesh of a lamb that has been killed by a wolf, the springing of a cat or a dog over a corpse before its burial, etc. Accordingly, it is easy to see that the clergy are clothed with a fearful power, for with the words, "Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," in their mouths, they may hold a Damocles sword over the heads of an ignorant and superstitious peasantry, and thus wield a power which one shudders to think of, especially if the clergy be unscrupulous and the people faithful and pious. Nay, the days when the clergy availed themselves of this mighty power are almost within our touch. Not only throughout the Middle Ages, but down certainly to the first decades of this century, the vampire played a great rôle in the East, and the clergy not only did not hesitate to use this excellent means of moulding the ignorant to their will, but took pains to disseminate the belief that excommunicated persons who died without having been absolved from the curse of the Church, became *ipso facto* vampires after death. The superstition is not to be regarded in the light of a mere myth which the peasantry believed in without having their lives influenced thereby for good or for bad. Nor was the belief confined to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peasantry; it had a firm hold on all classes, for we are told by learned and good men not merely that they know of this effect of excommunication by hearsay, but that they can vouch for it personally, because they have seen it with their own eyes. The Church claimed not only the power to excommunicate, but also the right to absolve from the curse pronounced by the ecclesiastical authorities. This absolution might be pronounced at any time, either before or after the death of the excommunicated person. Consequently it was possible for a dead man to remain a vampire for a season, and still get to heaven after a time, provided his friends had money or influence enough to procure for him absolution at the hands of the Church.

In Crete the priests were regarded as being very skilful in exorcising the vampire. Friday night was the proper time for the ceremony, because on that night the vampire usually remained in his tomb, but occasionally he absented himself even on Friday nights; in that case the exorcism failed, or, in other words, the officiating priest did not feel that he had made money enough out of his victim. When other means of laying the demon failed, the corpse was burned. Tournefort, in his 'Relation d'un Voyage du Levant' (i., 131 ff.), gives an amazing account of the laying of a vampire-demon by cremation in the island of Myconos. A quarrelsome peasant had been murdered in the fields. Two days after his burial it was known that he had appeared at night and played tricks on people. The priests sedulously spread the report, for it meant that masses would be said. On the tenth day after burial, solemn mass was said, the body was exhumed, and the heart was cut out by the village butcher—an operation attended by the escape of such noxious gases that the abundant use of incense was necessary. Every one was crying, "Vampire, vampire!" Some said that the blood was red; the butcher averred that the body was warm, others that the corpse was not stiff when carried out for burial—a sure sign that it was a genuine vampire. The heart of the corpse was burned on the seashore. But all this had no effect on the vampire, who continued his pranks as before; every one had some big tale to tell of his doings. It came, finally, to such a pitch that people abandoned their houses and encamped in the squares, and all were terrified at the approach of night. The priests reaped a rich harvest. All day long men were busy plunging swords into the grave, until a wise Albanian discovered that the hilts of the swords resembled a cross, and of all things the vampire fears the cross most because he can never leave his tomb as long as a cross is on it. He suggested the use of Turkish swords. But all was in vain; the vampire continued his wicked ways; the people were beside themselves with terror, and so many families emigrated to the neighboring islands that Myconos was threatened with depopulation. A great funeral pyre, consisting of wood, pitch, and tar, was erected on a jutting promontory of the island, and on it the remnants of the corpse were burned to ashes. The vampire was laid; Myconos had peace, and many ballads were composed in honor of the event.

The most available account of the vampire is that in Tozer's 'Researches in the Highlands of Turkey' (ii., 80 ff.), where the reader will also find the literature of the subject cited. J. R. S. STERRETT.

MEMOIRS OF MME. DE LA FERRONAYS. —II.

PARIS, August 9, 1899.

Many are the details which Madame de la Ferronays gives regarding the salons of Paris in the years preceding the Revolution of 1848. She herself began her apprenticeship as *maîtresse de maison*. "M. de la Ferronays desired that I should prepare myself to become his aid—in the measure which belongs to a woman—on the day when, as we hoped and wished, he should be called by the return of the King to have an employment at Court, or, as he would have much preferred, in diplomacy." Her sister, La Roche-Aymon, and herself lived then in great intimacy; all the agreeable men of their generation and of the older generation came to their house.

"In my youth, and I cannot imagine that the fashion has changed in this respect, men paid court to the women; they fell in love or pretended to do so. The *liaisons* were taken seriously; I could cite women who never consoled themselves for the pain given by a rupture. Between society men and women the question of money did not exist. Our betting with friends ended in exchanges of neckties, of ribbons, of umbrellas for canes at the utmost. A young man, in an intimate *liaison*, which lasted several years, with a lady among my friends, having dared, on the 1st of January, to offer her a diamond heart which had cost 400 francs, she became indignant, and sent it back, asking if he took her for a *fille entretenue*. . . . We attached so much importance to not allowing our manners to be similar in the smallest degree to those of the light ladies who abounded at the theatre or at supper parties, that we did not admit that the expenses should be divided among the men to our exclusion; and our friends did not dream of paying for us—we should have considered it a humiliation."

In the year 1847 M. de la Ferronays went to Venice to be presented to the Countess de Chambord.

"He did not find Madame pretty; but she had made an effort to please, and had shown herself amiable towards the French, having not yet reached the time when, as she often told me, she felt humiliated before them because of her sterility, and considered that, the more royalist they were, the more they ought to desire her death. The poor Princess, who can perhaps be reproached with not having had a beneficent influence over her husband, suffered cruelly for not having given a Dauphin to the country. Was it her fault? These are nature's secrets."

The Revolution of 1848 was a satisfaction and a sort of revenge for the Legitimist party. Madame de la Ferronays says about it:

"The throne of Louise-Philippe, erected by one revolution, was upset by another; but, whatever our sentiments at the time, it was a misfortune for the country. We should not now have to deplore the loss of two provinces; a respectable royal family would not have demoralized France by excess of luxury as the Empire did, and the sterility of Monseigneur [the Count de Chambord] would have given the branch of Bourbon-Orléans a legitimacy which it failed to have, to establish itself on a solid basis. But it is impossible for men to foresee the future; the passions do not reason; and by us royalists the fall of the July monarchy was hailed with joy."

The troubles which followed the Revolution, especially the bloody insurrection of June, 1848, against the Constituent Assembly, gave great hopes to the Legitimists.

"It was the time when, in the shops of Paris, Monseigneur was called 'Monsieur Crédit,' and when, under that name, his portraits figured in all the shops. My husband was soon to go to Frohsdorf, and in his illusions, of which I partook, he imagined that he would come back with the Prince, to whom he was to carry generals' uniforms. When the moment came for his taking the road to Frohsdorf, having carefully shut the doors, we ourselves put these precious uniforms in the trunks that were to take them to Austria; and while we were thus engaged, M. de la Ferronays said to me: 'You will see, my dear, that Monseigneur will accept the flag which France brings him, since, to keep his liberty entire, he has never worn a cockade on his hat or his clothing.' Those we were packing had none."

This little incident seems to show that in 1848 the Count de Chambord was not as absolutely hostile to the tricolor flag as he proved to be in 1872, when the Constituent Assembly chosen after the war was on the point of offering him the crown.

"During all the years," says Madame de la Ferronays, "anterior to the *Coup d'État*, negotiations were entered into with chiefs of army corps, and money was spent with open hands. MM. Berryer, De Valmy, and the Duke de Noailles always wished to retard the moment of action, not seeing that they were compromising success. Large sums were paid to a Marshal of France who was needy and received money from both sides. Every time, and it happened frequently, that M. de la Ferronays arrived at Frohsdorf, the Dauphiness, whom we called the Queen, said to him: 'Fernand, do bring us a colonel, or nothing will be done.' Once, he replied: 'Madame, I bring you better than a Colonel, a Marshal of France. Marshal Bugeaud asks Monseigneur if, on the day when he calls him in the midst of the army of the Alps, which he commands, he will be ready to come.' 'Immediately,' was the answer. But the Marshal imposed delay, and afterwards, for the misfortune of France, turned towards Louis Napoleon."

In 1850 M. de la Ferronays was completely attached to the person of the Count de Chambord, and accompanied him first to Wiesbaden. It was there that the Prince learned the death of Louis-Philippe. He at once ordered a mass to be said, and wished all his household to attend it. "It was an order for us all, and I must confess that we were a little astonished to go into mourning for a King whom we had never accepted, and whom we had always considered our most mortal enemy." The Count de Chambord spent the winter of 1851 at Venice; there was still some hope for the royalist party, and visitors were numerous. Among others came M. de Falloux, who had broken with Prince Louis Bonaparte. "M. de Falloux, whose dominant virtue was not frankness, came to Venice to play a sharp game. He wished to diminish the influence of the Duke de Lévis, and to surround the Count with new men, who would accept his leadership." Venice was full of princes. There were the Duke and the Duchess of Modena, the Duke and Duchess of Parma, the Infant Don Juan and his wife the Infanta Beatrix, sister of the Count de Chambord.

"The sight of the Duke of Parma and of the Infant Don Juan had the effect of putting Monseigneur in very bad humor. The Duke of Parma, rather disagreeable to everybody, was particularly so to the French, especially to those in the family of his brother-in-law, whom he made responsible, though they never had anything to do in the matter, for the conditions imposed on him in his marriage contract, by which he was not allowed to touch the fortune of the Princess, his wife."

The father of the Duke of Parma, the Duke of Lucca, had employed in his stables an Englishman called Ward, who entered more and more into his favor, and ended

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by becoming the preceptor of his son. The Revolution of 1849 turned the Duke of Lucca out of his states, and he abdicated in favor of his son, whom the death of Marie Louise, according to the terms of the Congress of Vienna, soon called to the throne of Parma.

"The Infant Don Juan was not handsome," says Mme. de la Ferronays, "and it was difficult to understand the passion which he inspired in the Archduchess Beatrix, who had become very deaf at this period. She was the mother of Don Carlos and of Don Alfonzo. . . . The poor Infanta became afterwards so deaf that the efforts which she made to hear the persons to whom she granted an audience, occasioned nervous attacks. It was a common infirmity with all the members of the house of Austria-Modena."

On her return to France, Mme. de la Ferronays witnessed the *Coup d'État* of the 2d of December. Paris woke up to the sound of the drums. Gen. Changarnier and other generals, the Deputies of the Chamber, were thrown into prison.

"My husband," she says, "had papers which might have been compromising; he confided them to me to be taken to a safe place, and, on my return to the Faubourg St. Germain, I had the painful pleasure of seeing pass before me Louis Napoleon, acclaimed by the troops which lined the avenue of the Champs-Élysées. It is the only time in my life that I screamed 'Vive la République!' a demonstration which had no result, not even to console my heart. . . . We were entering the era of sadness, even of some apostasies; but the manner in which these were received in society restricted their number. In the evening from a balcony at the circus of the Champs-Élysées, we saw carriages, surrounded by troops, which took some of the Deputies to Mont Valérien; all the others were taken to Vincennes. . . . Our poor friends and our chiefs were still so full of illusions that, while in certain regions people conceded to the new régime only the essentially Napoleonic duration of a Hundred Days, the chiefs advised my husband, who was sent to explain the situation to Monseigneur, to tell him expressly not to move, for there was every reason to believe that the President had only taken power to place it in his hands. Oh, how stupid honest people, intelligent as they may be, can sometimes be!"

This is Madame de la Ferronays's judgment of Louis Napoléon: "The new master of France was feeble and undecided; the will of M. de Morny and of M. Fleury had been necessary to lead him to an act of energy. He was a dreamer, a voluptuary, a good man at heart, liked by those who approached him, and having nothing of the terrible man he had the name of being."

Madame de la Ferronays is very severe on the Countess of Teba, who came to France with her mother, Madame de Montijo, and became the Empress of the French. This marriage, she says, "decided her fate as well as that of France, of which the handsome Spaniard, by her levity, her frivolity, and her incapacity to conduct the affairs she mixed herself up in, prepared the ruin. She contributed to the irreparable disasters under which our country has sunk."

Courtiers became more rare at Frohsdorf after the establishment of the Empire. "The grand figure of the daughter of Louis XVI. disappeared. For me she left a great void. She had always shown me great kindness. Her life had been that of a saint, and, if her speech was a little brusque, her heart was full of indulgence. People were unjust to her in France; they would not make allowance for the dreadful memories that confronted her when she reëntered the Tuileries, which she had left on the 10th of August."

Correspondence.

"OUR COUNTRY, RIGHT OR WRONG."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: For the last two or three months the idea has been growing in this country that, since the war in the Philippines is actually under way, no honorable course is open to us but to force it to a successful termination. Even among those who once most nobly took the side of justice toward the unfortunate islanders, this thought seems to be commending itself. Half-hearted humanitarians quiet an uneasy conscience by pleading the stain to national honor which would result from the slightest retraction in our exorbitant demands. But is not our country great and powerful enough to afford to be generous if by that means she can be just? Those who urge the bloody prosecution of an unjust war to save what they are pleased to call our national dignity, would do well to recall the position taken by our English defenders at the time of the Revolution. No hypocritical pride brought them to the low level of sanctioning the continuance of a wrong merely because it had been ignorantly and foolishly begun.

On October 31, 1776, in the House of Commons, Mr. Fox boldly and honorably declared:

"The noble Lord who moved the amendment said that we were in the dilemma of conquering or abandoning America. If we are reduced to that, I am for abandoning America."

And this champion of liberty, whom we all honor for his fearless honesty, entered his vote against a bill for raising revenues to maintain the war,

"because he could not conscientiously agree to grant any money for so destructive, so ignoble a purpose as the carrying on a war commenced unjustly, and supported with no other view than to the extirpation of freedom. This he conceived to be the strict line of conduct to be observed by a member of Parliament."

In November of the same year, Edmund Burke said in the House of Commons:

"You simply tell the colonists to lay down their arms, and then you will do just as you please. Could the most cruel conqueror say less? If you had conquered the Devil himself in Hell, could you be less liberal?"

And yet this is the identical policy which our Government is now enforcing with fire and sword, while we stand weakly by and say, "Let it go on, since we are in it."

And the great Chatham, as true a patriot as England ever knew, whose son resigned a commission in the English army rather than fight against liberty, said in the House of Lords, in the second year of the war:

"We have tried for unconditional submission; try what can be gained by unconditional redress. This country has been the aggressor. You have made descents upon their coasts; you have burnt their towns, plundered their country, made war upon the inhabitants, confiscated their property, proscribed and imprisoned their persons. I do therefore affirm that, instead of exacting unconditional submission from the colonies, we should grant them unconditional redress."

Again, a few months later, he declared with fervent earnestness:

"I would sell the shirt off my back to assist in proper measures, properly and wisely conducted; but I would not part with a single shilling to the present ministers. Their plans are founded in destruction and disgrace. It is, my Lords, a ruinous and destructive war; it is full of danger; it teems with disgrace, and must end in ruin. . . . If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country, I would never lay down my arms! Never! Never! Never!"

If England, far from feeling herself humiliated by such sentiments, coming from men high in official station, looks back to them as the truest patriots of that age, surely we Americans need dread no bitter judgment from posterity if we repeat those chivalrous and humane views.

Once before in our brief history our country fell from her lofty place among the nations, and plunged into a cowardly war with a helpless neighbor. Then, as now, the siren's song of pride corrupted our people. Then, as now, a short-sighted Administration forsook the straight path of moral rectitude and honored tradition, justifying a war of criminal aggression by the plea that we must not retreat. Then, as now, strong words of remonstrance were raised in Massachusetts, which are full of encouragement for us to-day. Charles Sumner, the ever-eloquent champion of justice, in an address to the people of Boston, on the 4th of February, 1847, exclaimed in righteous wrath:

"We are told that the country is engaged in the war, and therefore it must be maintained, or, as it is sometimes expressed, vigorously prosecuted. In other words, the violation of the Constitution and the outrage upon justice sink out of sight, and we are urged to the same acts again. By what necromancy do these pass from wrong to right? In what book of morals is it written that what is bad before it is undertaken becomes righteous merely from the circumstance that it is commenced? Who on earth is authorized to transmute wrong into right? Whoso admits the unconstitutionality and injustice of the war, and yet sanctions its prosecution, must approve the Heaven-defying sentiment, 'Our country, right or wrong.' Can this be the sentiment of Boston? If so, in vain are her children nurtured in the churches of the Pilgrims, in vain fed from the common table of knowledge bountifully supplied by our common schools. Who would profess allegiance to wrong? Who would deny allegiance to right? Had this sentiment been received by our English defenders in the war of the Revolution, no fiery tongue of Chatham, Burke, Fox, or Camden would have been heard in our behalf. Their great testimony would have failed. All would have been silenced, while crying that the country, right or wrong, must be carried through the war."

May we not rise above the unreasonable and vicious idea that what we all condemn in an individual, we may sanction in the state? The just man, when he sees himself in the wrong, is restrained by no shallow pride from desisting, and making amends to the full extent of his ability. Should not a nation do as much? A word from our Government, guaranteeing to this brave and heroic people the blessings of that dearly loved liberty which years of struggle had all but won, would end the carnage in a moment. Can we, in the light of history, honorably refuse so small a sacrifice? S.

August 19, 1899.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MIXED FILIPINOS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: There are more people on the Philippine Islands than were in the whole western hemisphere when Columbus discovered America. In the latter, moreover, the population was homogeneous throughout, but in our new archipelago the blood of all mankind flows in the veins of its heterogeneous population. For the white sub-species, you have Semite, Hamite, European, and Iranic ingredients; for the yellow, Malay and Chinese; for the brown, the Polynesian supplies the blood; and for the black sub-species there are twenty thousand Negritos, or dwarf negroes. Even the American Indian cannot be omitted, for, during two centuries, between 1565 and 1765 about, the Philippines were governed exclusively from Acapulco, Mexico.

Concerning the Negritos, Dr. A. B. Meyer, director of the Royal Ethnographic Museum, Dresden, publishes a timely book of a hundred pages, issued in English by Stengel, in Dresden. The text forms two chapters of his greater work on Philippine types, printed in folio in 1893. Ethnologists will be glad to have these chapters in handy form, since not only do they bring to date what is really known of this interesting people, but the author attacks with vigor the unsubstantiated theories concerning a negroid substratum in all the Indo-Pacific islands and southeastern Asia promulgated by Quatrefages and Hamy, endorsed by Flower and Lydecker, and put in general circulation by Keane. O. T. MASON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 24, 1899.

Notes.

Miss Lilian Whiting's 'Kate Field: A Record' is on the point of being issued by Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

Thomas Whittaker will soon publish 'My Smoking-Room Companion,' a satirical sketch by William Harvey King, M.D.

The Continental Publishing Co. announces 'A Daughter of Neptune,' stories of East and West, by William Winslow.

Mrs. Mabel Loomis Todd of Amherst has just completed a thorough revision of Dr. Dorman Steele's text-book, 'A New Descriptive Astronomy,' which is now in the press of the American Book Company.

'An Autumn Lane, and Other Poems,' by Will T. Hale, is in the press of Barbee & Smith, Nashville.

The Moravian Book Concern (The Comenius Press), Bethlehem, Pa., will shortly publish 'Fifty Years Ago,' by Mary Wiley Staver, a description of a trip to England and the Continent, with illustrations.

The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, will issue next month 'Solomon and Solomonic Literature,' by Moncure D. Conway; 'Science and Faith; or, Man as an Animal and Man as a Member of Society,' by Dr. Paul Topinard; and 'The Evolution of General Ideas,' by Th. Ribot, translated by Miss Frances A. Welby.

'A First Glance at the Birds,' by Charles A. Keeler, being a general introduction to the study of California birds and an advance portion of a larger work, 'Bird Notes Afield,' by the same author, will be brought out at once in pamphlet form by Elder & Shepard, San Francisco.

Mr. Miller Christy's undertaking to write an exhaustive and authoritative 'History of the Hudson's Bay Company,' after personal research in the archives of England, France, and Canada, and with access to the Company's records, has not been affected by the approaching appearance of two other works on the same subject by Beckles Willson and Prof. Bryce of Winnipeg.

'Through Persia on a Side-Saddle,' by Ella C. Sykes (Lippincott), a fairly stout volume, is an unpretentious account of the author's experiences in her travels about Persia and while keeping house for her brother, the first British Consul appointed to the city of Kerman. She writes in a good-humored, straightforward way, describing what she saw and did, and wisely not attempting to give much information about anything else. The book reads well, and, though containing little in the nature of exciting adventure, will interest those who care for books of travel or for descriptions of the part of the East in question.

The fifth part of David W. Hoyt's 'Old Families of Salisbury and Amesbury, Mass.' (Providence) completes the work, and finds room for some additional documents, with additions and corrections and three indexes. An odd erratum pointed out was caused by some one's misreading a passage in Isaac Estey's will (Topsfield), "daughter Sarah *I reckon* she had her full portion upon her marriage," making it "Sarah *Ireland*."

The time of the army upheaval in France is propitious for the appearance of Part I. of 'A French-English Military Technical Dictionary,' prepared by Cornélis De Witt Willcox, First Lieutenant of Artillery, U. S. A., and issued from the Adjutant-General's Office at Washington. The 160 closely printed octavo pages, ending with *espace*, contrast sharply with the total 118 pages of Barrère's pocket 'Dictionary of French and English Military Terms (French-English),' which was published by Hachette in 1896. Lieut. Willcox's labor is worthy of all praise. The proof-reading appears to have been very scrupulous. While *canaille de D——* will not be found in this vocabulary, *bordereau* is given, with a number of qualifications (*énonciatif, énumératif, nominatif*, etc.). Of *coup*, 192 different definitions are given. Under *école* there is a list of the French military schools. Not least interesting are the instances of military argot, as *bal*, 'extra drill,' and *Dache*, 'hairdresser to the Zouaves' (a mythical personage), used in the phrase *Allez raconter cela à Dache*, "Go tell that to the marines." The author gives a list of 129 authorities, which includes 30 official French publications and 45 lithographed text-books of the Artillery and Engineers School at Fontainebleau.

Part 26 of Hatzfeld's 'Dictionnaire Général de la Langue Française' (Paris: Ch. Delagrave) finishes the letter R, and carries the letter S to *soulever*. In this section occur an unusual number of characteristic compounds, such as *songe-malice, sot-l'y-laisse*, Saint-Simon's *sauve-l'honneur*, and one of the newest, *saute-ruisseau*, a sort of errand-boy (admitted by the Academy in 1878). *Sauve-qui-peut* takes its alphabetical place, instead of being put under *sauver*, as the Academy treats it. The same authority from 1718 to 1740 printed *sans-souci* without the hyphen, which it conceded to *sang-froid* only in 1798. (A century earlier, it is recorded, some used the expression *sens froid*.) *Savoir-faire* and *savoir-vivre* were both deprecated as neologisms in 1671; and while the Academy adopted the former very speedily, in 1674, it turned a cold shoulder on the latter till 1740. Of three significant words the etymology is quite obscure—*sobriquet*, used in our modern sense in the fifteenth century; *sot*, and *souche*. About four more parts will complete this compact, scholarly, yet popular dictionary.

The gullibility of Quesnay de Beaurepaire, the late President of the Paris Court of Appeals, is a striking example of the monomania of suspicion not unknown in actual life and on the comic stage. His fanatic belief in the guilt of Dreyfus has made him more than once the dupe of tricksters whose wiles any schoolboy of ordinary intelligence would have seen through. Any one interested in this psychological problem should read 'Karl et Quesnay de Beaurepaire' (Paris: P. V. Stock). "Karl" is the wag, probably a student of the Latin Quarter, who, after easily making his victim swallow the bait of "irrefragable evidence" against Dreyfus, exposed his credulity in the *Figaro* to the laughter of the world. "It was upon the judgment of this man that the liberty, the honor, the lives of a host of unfortunate men and women depended. . . . The fate of hundreds of these was at the mercy of such want of sagacity and common sense." And then the question arises: Is it probable that this judge of the highest rank is the only one of his kind? What influence will the discovery of such incapacity have upon the popular respect for the law and its representatives?

The tenth volume of the 'Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society' (Halifax) covers the years 1896-98, and consists of a monograph by T. Watson Smith, D.D., on 'The Slave in Canada.' This subject has been all but completely ignored by historians and school-book makers—"Clement, the author of the school history accepted by nearly all the provinces, dismisses it in a single sentence"—so that the present generation, even among the well informed, is sceptical of the existence of slavery on provincial soil. Dr. Smith has been at great pains to establish the fact with such minuteness that no one will attempt the task again. The courts virtually abolished slavery long before the British Emancipation Act of 1833 could operate upon it in Canada, and apprehension as to the effects of this measure related wholly to the trade relations between Canada and the West Indies. Of the indemnity for emancipation, "not one solitary dollar found its way into Canadian hands." Dr. Smith has produced not only a permanently valuable book, but a very readable story, which has hitherto been covered up, not from shame, but from forgetfulness. He has few if any cases of extreme cruelty to record, and no instance of burning alive or dead. His survey would not have been complete without a chapter on Canada as the American fugitives' paradise—a glorious page. While he adds to our knowledge from his side of the line, he has not fully studied the sources of our Underground Railway history. His caption, "Influence of Canadians on Slavery Elsewhere," might have been illustrated by the fact that the leader of the moral agitation against slavery in the United States would, but for the accident of his parents' removal to Massachusetts, have been a native of Nova Scotia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The annual report of the State Geologist of New Jersey for 1898 embraces as an appendix Mr. Gifford Pinchot's "Study of Forest Fires and Wood Production in Southern New Jersey," a document of 100 pages, copiously illustrated, which will, we are sure, mark the beginning of the final effort to save that district from a scourge whose effects are moral as well as physical. Closely allied to this is Mr. C. C. Vermeule's briefer paper on the pine belt of the same section in connection with water supply, a subject of great moment that cannot be too soon considered. The same authority, whose investigation of the volume of streams in New Jersey and available surface water-supply took rank at once as a standard work, makes here a first attempt to solve the more complex problem of water-supply from wells, which is nevertheless inseparable from that of surface-supply. Mr. Lewis Woolman furnishes his annual record of artesian wells in New Jersey, which is contributing so much towards a definition of water-bearing strata not confined to that State alone. Prof. Rollin D. Salisbury sums up, from the practical side, his studies in the surface geology, characterizing the various soils in relation to the underlying formations and to their economic utility. Dr. Kümmel passes beyond the State limits on the north in order to complete, in Rockland County, N. Y., his study of the Triassic red sandstones and trap rocks. The result is confirmatory rather than novel. The variability in the thickness of the trap sheet is still remarkable, but more difficult to determine accurately. While it is sometimes 400 feet above the Hudson River level, at certain points it lies beneath.

The Secretary of Agriculture aims to make the Department's Yearbook for 1899 a summary of what has been done in this country towards scientific agriculture during the lapsing century, and to distribute 50,000 copies at the Paris Exposition. Mr. Gifford Pinchot of the Division of Forestry accordingly solicits information regarding the efforts of private landowners to apply the principles of forestry economically and conservatively. He will send a card with printed inquiries to any one desirous to assist in collecting these statistics.

A circular from the committee of forestry and roadside improvement of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society, Boston, asks about the kind of trees adorning the roadside in any locality, their thriving, objectionableness, etc. Answers are solicited before October 1.

The *Geographical Journal* for August opens with Col. J. R. L. Macdonald's account of his explorations in the almost unknown country to the north of Uganda and east of the Nile. The principal geographical result was the discovery that the high and healthy plateau which lies between Lake Victoria and the coast runs far to the northward, though at a reduced altitude. Parts of it were highly cultivated and thickly inhabited, in one district with "a magnificently developed people of great stature" and "possessing immense herds of cattle, donkeys, sheep, and goats." "Each village or little group of villages has its own chief, but important matters are settled by a council of all the chiefs, and, as there are very strict and recognized rules regarding the settlement of serious disputes, there is no fighting between these numerous settlements." Another thing which distinguishes them from most African tribes is that "marriage is not merely a matter of barter. If the girl objects to marry her suitor, her refusal is absolute and settles the matter." Supplementary to this is an account, by Major H. H. Austin, of a branch expedition which he led to the north of Lake Rudolf, in which he succeeded in making a comparatively thorough survey of the western shore. There were evidences of the lake's westward encroachment on the land. "At one point," he says, "we observed a regular line of trees, extending for a distance of between two and three miles out into the lake." Prof. A. G. Nathorst summarizes the scientific results of the Swedish Arctic expedition of 1898, and calls attention to the bacteriological investigations. In a total of 4,400 gallons of the atmosphere filtered in a score of different localities, the doctor of the expedition "did not discover a single bacterium, and only an infinitesimal quantity of aspergillus, or mould." He "further examined the intestinal contents of a number of different animals, but without, generally speaking, discovering any traces of bacteria." Among the collections brought home were "numerous specimens of red snow and green snow," besides mammals and birds which will, it is hoped, form the nucleus of an Arctic Biological Museum.

P. Leendertz, jr., in *Noord en Zuid*, treats of "The Names of the Months," a subject of much interest to Dutch and Flemish scholars. This was the most vexatious problem connected with popularizing the Roman calendar in the Netherlands, which was not accomplished until long after the term of Roman occupation. While the remote German progenitors of the present Netherlanders had not names for all the twelve months, their descendants gradually evolved one hundred and twenty-eight, more than a dozen of which, gleaned from mediæval manuscript almanacs in the Royal Library, have not been given by any other authority. These one hundred and twenty-eight examples (of which a careful list is drawn up, with a glossary) are ranged in eight classes, according to derivation from the season, the weather, the occupations of man, the products of nature, the products of industry, the habits of animals, pagan and civic festivals, and church festivals. Some of these are still in use, though not often now found in print. Naturally, each month received many names, while one name often did duty for more than one month. Not only might many of the above matters occur in more than one month, but the discrepancy between the lunar and the solar year often demanded the insertion of a whole month, which took the name of its predecessor, bringing all the names wrong the next year, and, this not being of rare occurrence, great confusion ensued. To remedy this, Charlemagne chose twelve of the names, and tried to have them generally used, but failed. The Church secured greater uniformity, but only by substituting the Latin names, which steadily gained ground, despite the efforts of purists and patriots. Why? Grimm says, no doubt rightly, because of ambiguity and clumsiness in the popular names.

The timely subject of the decadence of the Latin nations is treated in an article by Prof. Giuseppe Sergi of the University of Rome, in the *Nuova Antologia* for August 1 ("Come sono decadute le nazioni latine"). Passing in rapid review the nations of the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris, of Asia Minor, Egypt, and Greece, the writer dwells more at length upon the Roman Empire, and winds up with the people of Italy, Spain, and France, in order to show that all of these either have passed away or are threatened with the same fate from one and the same cause, viz., immobility, or the desire to maintain unaltered and intact from foreign influences the civilization transmitted to them or developed by them. There is but one means by which a nation can resist the progressive impulses from outside without being doomed to extinction, namely, absolute isolation. It is thus that China has till now continued her national existence, but she belongs to "social palæontology," and now that she has been forced to open her frontiers to outsiders her days seem to be numbered. Corruption, vice, luxury, etc., can be considered only as concomitant causes of the decadence of the Roman Empire and of nations in general. The Renaissance in Italy could have become a real *risorgimento* only by repudiation of the Roman tradition, and, together with it, of the morbid aspiration of reviving the Empire; while, in fact, it was not a *rinascimento* but a *rinvecchiamento*, destined, as far as the reinvigoration of the nation is concerned, to failure. In modern Italy, Latinity, through the classical school, is still viewed as a continuation of Roman life: a fatal anachronism, a sign of inhibition to modern progress. These few points will suffice to show the trend of Prof. Sergi's essay, and to suggest the originality of his thesis and arguments.

In consequence of the unrestricted sale of alcoholic liquors in France, the number of *débits* in the country has reached the enormous figure of 424,500, or one to every eighty-five inhabitants. No wonder, therefore, that the private organizations struggling against the evil of alcoholism are coming to be looked upon as insufficient, and that legislative action is resorted to. A measure, aiming at the gradual reduction of the places for the sale of liquor to one for every three hundred inhabitants, was introduced during the last session in the Senate and has found many supporters all over the land. At the same time, the crusade against strong drink is being vigorously carried on by numerous temperance societies, forming together the Union Française Antialcoolique (5 Rue de Latran, Paris), which publishes a monthly journal under the editorship of Dr. Legrain, the head of the inebriate asylum at Ville-Evrard. In the army and navy the temperance movement has also taken root, and much zeal is displayed by teachers and school inspectors in the provinces. From Cahors (the home of Gambetta), *e. g.*, it is reported that there are as many branches of the temperance league as there are schools in the district, and "games have been organized so that even hardened drinkers prefer, on Sundays, the bowling-alley in front of the school-house to the tavern." It is rather curious that wine-growers, *i. e.*, those not manufacturing distilled liquors, are looked upon as the stanchest friends of the temperance league. In so-called temperance restaurants limited quantities of natural wine are served with the meals, if desired. "Total ab-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stinence" has reference to spirituous liquors.

The death of Dr. William Wright has directed attention to the extraordinary growth of the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society, of which he was for more than twenty years the linguistic superintendent. During that time 153 new versions of the Bible, in whole or in part, were added to the Society's list, which now contains 364 versions in different languages and dialects. This means that the same influence which the English Bible has exerted on the English character and tongue since the days of Wiclif and Tyndale is now being exerted on multitudinous races and tribes.

The practical boycott of the Indian coolie and merchant throughout Africa, with the sole exception of British East Africa, is apparently about to lead to the development on a vast scale of unoccupied land in India. In Assam alone, the province adjoining Bengal, whose population taxes the utmost food-producing powers of the soil, out of eight and one-half millions of cultivable land only one and three-quarter millions are occupied. It is proposed to bring this great region into communication with the congested province by the extension of the Assam-Bengal Railway, the construction of roads and tramways, and the granting of tracts not exceeding 10,000 acres for thirty-three years free of taxation to native capitalists, on condition that they clear their grant of forest and jungle. This would create a proprietary body, which is contrary to the settled policy of the Indian Government, namely, to secure the land to the actual tillers of the soil; but the exigencies of the situation may compel the adoption of the scheme.

Our correspondent "D. B." calls attention to an error in his interesting letter on the Isle of Man in the *Nation* of August 3, where one should read £10,000 instead of £10 as the tribute the island annually pays to the Imperial Government. An error of quite as grave significance in a different category arose on p. 136 (No. 1781), when quoting the lines lent by Mrs. Wordsworth to her husband. "That *inward* eye which is the bliss of solitude," was fatally disfigured by lapse of pen or memory into *inner*.

—Prince Kropotkin continues, in the September *Atlantic*, his lurid narrative in his restrained and considered style. It embraces the assassination of Alexander II., Kropotkin's expulsion from Switzerland a few months later, and his subsequent life, first on French soil, later in London, again in France, his arrest under the new extradition treaty between France and Prussia, his imprisonment at Clairvaux, with his release and return to London in '86. His estimate of Alexander II. is not ungenerous, but, excepting the prison episode, there is in this instalment of the memoirs more of the inverted vocabulary peculiar to anarchism, hence more to alienate sympathy, than before. Prof. Hugo Münsterberg's article, "The Germans and the Americans," we discuss elsewhere. A foregleam of the promised Life of John Murray Forbes by his daughter is afforded in Mr. Edward Waldo Emerson's agreeable biographical notice of that perfect citizen. Mr. Crothers's paper on "The Mission of Humor," like Saadi, sits in the sun. Blessed are they, says the Psalmist, who, going through the vale of misery, use it for a well. This article will show them how. The only short story in the magazine is a particularly good one, by Elia Peattie. Is the Contributors' Club asleep or dead or peradventure on a journey?

—The proposed American interoceanic canal is the principal subject of the August number of the *National Geographic Magazine* (Washington). In a striking article on its commercial aspects, Mr. Joseph Nimmo, jr., formerly Chief of the Bureau of Statistics in the Treasury Department, calls attention to the fact that, though $1,326,176 has been appropriated within four years to ascertain the engineering features and cost of construction, "not one cent has been appropriated by Congress for the purpose of ascertaining the probable commercial value of the project—*i. e.*, the amount of shipping which would pass through it." Yet section 231 of the Revised Statutes expressly provides for the preparation and submission to Congress of "full statements of all existing facts tending to show to what extent the general commerce of the country will be promoted" by such works as this. The assertion of the advocates of the canal that its commercial necessity is so clear that it needs no investigation, he meets with the fact that it is not the shortest nor most practicable route for the trade of our Atlantic seaports with Asia or Australasia. The distance from New York to Manila by the Suez Canal—a sea-level canal, whereas the Nicaragua involves 220 feet of lockage—is 181 miles less than by the Nicaragua Canal. As to the anticipated commerce of the States east of the Rockies with the Pacific States, he holds it impossible to believe that, with the present number of transcontinental railroads and the low cost of transportation (the average rate being "about one-third the average of the rates which prevailed thirty years ago"), any important part of this trade could be diverted to the canal. This conviction is strengthened by the fact that railroad competition has proved almost destructive of river and canal traffic. The commerce with South America is not an appreciable factor, as it is mostly carried on by sailing vessels, and the canal is impracticable for them. In fact, "the general trend of the evolution of transportation facilities during the last twenty years has been in the direction of reducing the possible tonnage of any American interoceanic canal. From a computation based upon all the controlling conditions of the present day, I conclude that not more than 400,000 tons of shipping annually can be confidently expected to pass through any such canal. The receipts from any American interoceanic canal from tolls would therefore be insufficient to meet the expenses of its maintenance and administration, with nothing for interest on cost of construction, amounting probably to eight million dollars a year."

—Armando Ferrari discusses in the Milan *Perseveranza* the origin of the sonnet. In time it remounts to the first decades of the thirteenth century. In structure, Biadene has shown that it arose from a fusion of a *strambotto* of eight lines and one of six. This glee form of verse has never ceased to flourish in Sicily. What region of Italy was to be credited with the fusion is the chief matter in debate. Ferrara bases an argument on a *disputa* on love, of which the joint authors were a Tuscan, Jacopo Mostacci of Pisa; a Neapolitan, the youthful Pier della Vigna of Capua; and a Sicilian, the notary Jacopo da Lentini. The *disputa* (an imitation of the Provençal) was opened by Mostacci, who had recourse to the *strambotto* of eight lines, but found the vessel too small for its contents, and so annexed the six-line *strambotto*. The fourteen, making one body, he passed on to Pier della Vigna, who responded in kind, while Lentini capped their efforts with one of his own, without, however, uniting the two *strambotti*. Ferrari supposes plausibly that the three friends met at the University of Bologna, then a great seat of learning; and it is notorious that at that epoch Pier della Vigna was a student there. By this clever boxing of the compass Ferrari satisfies many local ambitions. The Sonnet, of Sicilian components, was born in Bologna about 1224; a Pisan called it in being with the aid of two representatives of the southern provinces. Crossing the Apennines into Tuscany, it there flowered to perfection under Dante's care and Petrarch's. What poetic form could be more thoroughly national?

—With keen regret we record the death at Seal Harbor, Maine, on August 3, of William McCrillis Griswold, son of the late Rufus Wilmot Griswold, but better known as the creator of the "Q. P. Indexes." This series embraced the *North American Review*, *Lippincott's Magazine*, the elder *Scribner*, the *Eclectic*, *Harper's Weekly*, some British and some German historical magazines, Essays, etc., and a line of "Q. P. Annuals." It was, moreover, initiated with a general index to the *Nation* (1865-1880, afterwards extended to 1885, with a contemplated and perhaps commenced extension to date). It was entirely characteristic of Mr. Griswold that he undertook this most useful work, peculiarly useful to the editors of the *Nation* itself, without previous consultation with them or any request for support, so that its appearance was a complete surprise. It was but one mark of Mr. Griswold's attachment to this journal, to which he was a more or less frequent contributor, as well as its ever friendly critic. The scope of the Index was literary, historical, social, and economic, and left room for one political; and this, entitled 'A Record of Politics and Politicians in the United States, 1865-1882,' with occasional references to other sources than the *Nation*, was subsequently (1883) produced, equally unsolicited and unheralded, and has a value quite beyond any probable general appreciation of it. Of all Mr. Griswold's indexes it is proper to say that they bore the strongest marks of the "personal equation." He was his own publisher; his labors could fairly be called disinterested, since the pecuniary return was most precarious; hence, a studied condensation, with signs and symbols offering no little obstacle to rapid reference. Even some phonetic deformations in line with the so-called reform (applicable last of all to an index) were philanthropically adopted by Mr. Griswold. These eccentricities were reinforced by an imperfect knowledge of the mechanic art of printing. But, all deductions made, the Quarterly Periodical Indexes were and will ever remain a great boon to students.

—This indexical passion, rather than gift, was manifested in other ways—in a com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pilation of narratives called 'Travel,' 'France,' 'Germany,' and 'Switzerland' respectively, and in Descriptive Lists of Novels, of much higher and more permanent worth. Here the classification was carried out by countries, and even by sections in the case of the United States; and current criticism of each work was cited, according to the editor's lights or material. In the prosecution of this task, Mr. Griswold employed and increased his exceptional knowledge of the more or less forgotten periodicals of the day of small things in American letters—the period of his father's literary activity as journalist and author (to mention but one of his numerous works) of the 'Poets and Poetry of America.' Mr. Griswold bore with a rare philosophy the renewed assaults of latter-day admirers of Poe upon his father's memory, which Mr. Woodberry's supreme biography effectually vindicated against the charge of malignity towards the poet. Only a year ago did he publish, not an apologia, but a truthful portrait by indirection of his father, consisting of the frankest presentation of 'Passages from the Correspondence and Other Papers of Rufus W. Griswold.' Our readers can turn to the review in No. 1742 of the *Nation* to refresh their memory of this very important landmark in our literary history. It was, unfortunately, marred by defects in construction, and, being a private venture like all the rest of its author's, it fell somewhat flat, but no public library can afford to be without it. It was an honorable as well as a pious termination of Mr. Griswold's labors. The death of this not more indefatigable than modest worker was untimely. He was born in Bangor, Maine, in 1853, and graduated at Harvard College in 1875. A wife and children survive him.

—Probably the most noteworthy of the many efforts put forth to secure a modification or revision of the steps recently taken by the Russian Government against the national individuality of the Finns, has been a series of appeals, on the part of the savants, scholars, artists, and other non-political men of prominence in all the leading countries of Europe, addressed to the Czar. It is a singular phenomenon that the movement was spontaneous and independent in these various countries, and in all practically on the supposition that the Czar himself had not a clear conception of the far-reaching evils of his decree, so that the addresses were virtually appeals "from the Czar poorly informed to the Czar better informed." The German address could circulate only for a short period, but nevertheless secured 160 signatures from among the brightest minds of the country. Lister's name heads the English list, while the French bears the names of many members of the Academy. The Italian address contains an exceptionally long list of prominent names; Austria and Hungary each sent one of their own; the Belgians sent both a Flemish and a French appeal; and in those of Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden the signatures of the leading thinkers and authors are found. It is rarely that an international manifestation of this character, without a central impetus, proves so extensive and successful among this class of men. Recently a deputation of prominent scholars and savants assembled in St. Petersburg, and asked for permission to present an address to the Czar, but an audience was refused them.

TUCKER'S CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Constitution of the United States: A Critical Discussion of its Genesis, Development, and Interpretation. By John Randolph Tucker, LL.D., late Professor of Constitutional and International Law and Equity in Washington and Lee University. Edited by Henry St. George Tucker, Professor [in the same chair]. Chicago: Callaghan & Co. 1899. Two volumes, octavo, pp. xxviii, 1,015.

The son of "Randolph Tucker" has done well in publishing these volumes. Although not quite finished, and never revised by the author, they preserve for us with substantial fulness the constitutional views, and the grounds of them, held by one of the best and ablest of modern Virginia statesmen; one who was true to the old doctrines of his State, and who had the opportunity to restate them and attempt their vindication in the light of what has been decided since that great event which is known at the South as "the war between the States." Whoever takes up this book, having known the delightful man that wrote it, so full of character, intellectual energy, and a contagious, irresistible generosity and kindness of nature, almost the type of what we think of as best in the old-fashioned gentleman of Virginia, will need no urging to read it. All who knew him must rejoice to see this record of his best and most serious thinking—a book full of interest and instruction.

Whether one agrees with the writer's fundamental positions or not, and whether or not one finds them in harmony with the later decisions of our Supreme Court, he will, at any rate, agree that they are clearly stated, put with force, and carried out to logical conclusions. And the reader who has been bred on other meat than this will do well to reflect that what he finds here has got to be reckoned with. It may not agree with what our courts are laying down today; but the history of our Supreme Court teaches us that the fashion of courts passeth away; what is prevalent in this age may vanish in the next.

This book is not, properly speaking, a law book, a treatise on constitutional law, but rather, what its title imports, a commentary on the Constitution of the United States by a lawyer. We have chapters of political philosophy, followed by textual criticism and exposition and historical explanation; and also a fairly full statement and criticism of the cases. The legal aspect of the subject is not the sole or even the primary one.

The author's fundamental conception of the instrument is seen in such a passage as the following. He has been saying that while the States have the greater number of powers, the Federal Government has "preëminence in the reach and majesty of power. . . . But in their essential sovereignty of dominion they are alike and of equal dignity." And then he adds (p. 847):

"The real question in the comparison of the two classes [of powers] is as to the holders of the respective powers. The Federal Government holds the one class and the State Governments the other class. Back of both is the reserved authority of the States, as delegators of both classes, and as the original source of all powers belonging to both governments. The powers held by the Federal and State Governments are delegated to them by the States, as the bodies-politic, with essential sovereignty, from which emanate the functional capacities of each of these governments."

The writer goes on to say that this is demonstrated by the fact that the Constitution prohibits the States from exercising the powers delegated to the Federal Government. Why prohibit, if it was not necessary? "Annul the prohibition by striking out this section, and these powers would belong to the State governments concurrently with the Federal Government." This reasoning may seem inadequate, but the style of it is characteristic of that method of discussion, refined, ingenious, academic, which our old Northern Federalists used to wonder at when they first met the Virginia statesmen in Congressional debate. The Virginia Federalists had it, and even the judicial opinions of Marshall, the greatest of them all, are full of it.

The meaning of the passage above quoted will be elucidated by adding the writer's explanation of some of these phrases. In an earlier part of the book he describes the "body-politic" as "the corporate unity of the many, bound together in society," and points out that the "distinction between the body-politic and the Government is fundamental and essential." The former

"is not the Government, nor the persons admitted to participate in the functions of Government, but it is the whole body of persons politically associated. . . . A constitution . . . is the act by which the Body-politic constitutes the Government and delegates and limits its powers. . . . The Body-politic is creator; the Government its creature; the Body-politic is principal; the Government its agent. . . . Every Government is the delegated agent of some organic Body-politic. . . . Destroy the Government and the Body-politic remains. Destroy the Government of a State, and the State still stands. But destroy the Government of the United States, and what single Body-politic remains? All that would remain would be the forty-five Bodies-politic—the States."

The writer agrees that the fourteenth amendment is a final, authoritative denial of the doctrine of secession, of a legal right to withdraw from the Union; but he holds that the fundamental character of the Union remains unchanged, that it is still merely a compact between States whose only bond is the Constitution. There is no "merger or fusion" of States or people into a new Body-politic. There is only a new "Government," discharging certain functions for the States. We are "functionally one" as to the delegated Federal powers, but "organically separate" as independent States.

Such a theory as contrasted with that simpler view, which time and events seem likely to uphold, viz., that the people of each State have created a new nation by contributing a share of their power to a common stock — each the same share — must, of course, bear fruit in the interpretation of the Constitution. Very different results are reached from such different premises. See, for example, the influence of our author's fundamental theory in his ingenious argumentation about the legal-tender question (p. 514):

"Congress can coin money; the States cannot. And the gold and silver coin struck by Congress becomes legal tender because the States are forbidden to make anything else legal tender. The denial to the States to make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender indicates that, but for this prohibition, the States might have done so. This prohibition to the States and the grant to Congress result in the conclusion that Congress can make current a coin which is legal tender in the payment of debts, and against which the States cannot discriminate. If this be so, how can bills emitted under the power to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

borrow money, and not as currency, be a legal tender for any debt?"

And again (p. 825), in speaking of the prohibition on the States, we read that if this be put with the clause giving Congress the power to coin money, the clause

"would then be as if it read, 'Congress shall have the power to coin gold and silver coins, and no State shall make any but these a tender in the payment of debts.' . . . There is no power given to Congress, nor a hint of a power in Congress, to make anything a tender in the payment of debts. . . . It would, therefore, seem to be a sound interpretation of these kindred clauses of the Constitution, that while Congress was to be the instrument for putting the stamp of currency upon coins of gold and silver, in order to create a circulating medium, the States were forbidden to make anything but these coins a tender in the payment of debts, and no power was delegated to the United States to do so; and therefore, as a medium for the solution of debts between man and man, the Constitution intended that the gold and silver coin stamped by Congress, as well as foreign coin, . . . to be regulated by Congress, was to be the only medium for the payment of debts under the system established by the Constitution."

And again (p. 516):

"If, then, the Constitution has made gold and silver coin the only legal tender, and Congress has power to strike these coins, and this power to coin is denied to the States as well as the power to make any other than these coins a legal tender, it would seem to follow that Congress may coin both metals, and can deny to neither the functions of money. As the States are confined to both, as legal tender, Congress must furnish both."

Even as hard as that the author is willing to squeeze his grapes! When one reads this sort of reasoning, he seems to be living in the days before the war. There is much else that gives a like impression. The Dred Scott case, for example, is cited repeatedly as if it had decided what was merely the dictum of two or three judges. It never was the law of the Supreme Court that negroes, merely as such, or even negroes the descendants of slaves, were not citizens, capable, merely as such, of litigating in the Federal Courts. Again, the writer puts forward the old doctrine as to the inability of Congress to keep slavery out of the Territories, and denies the validity of the reconstruction acts and of any power to hold the rebellious States under military government when they had laid down their arms. Indeed, one finds here most of the main consequences of that highly elaborated theory of our national Constitution which had been worked out at the South of old, under the influence of a *parti pris*, to protect their local institution of slavery. It is fortunate that these doctrines have now to fight their way and hold their own, if they can, North and South, simply upon their merits. It will probably be found, in this open field of controversy, that they will not fit the facts of the past any better than they will serve the purposes of the future.

In arriving at a theoretical conclusion in favor of the judicial power to disregard legislative enactments as unconstitutional, Mr. Tucker adopts the view of Marshall that it is necessarily involved in the idea of a written constitution. He does not advert, any more than Marshall did, to the experience of other countries having such constitutions yet recognizing no such power in the courts. In considering the scope of this power, he says, forcibly and justly:

"If the court be in doubt whether a law be or be not in pursuance of the Constitution—where the repugnancy is not clear and beyond reasonable doubt—it should refrain from making the law void in effect by its judgment, lest it should be really repealing a valid law by legislative act, instead of declaring it void by judicial act. . . . The obligation of the Constitution on a judge in respect to his judicial functions is different from its obligation on a legislator or executive officer. . . . The oath of the judge binds him to support the Constitution as to the prescribed limits of his jurisdiction as a precondition to his discharge of his function in declaring a law to be unconstitutional. His duty to do the latter depends upon whether his jurisdiction extends to it; and, unless it clearly extends to it, in undertaking to decide on the unconstitutionality of a law he may pass the boundaries of his jurisdiction, and exercise the legislative power of repeal; therefore he cannot declare a law void or unconstitutional unless for clear and undoubted repugnancy. The case is different with the legislator and the executive. . . . If he doubts his power . . . he is bound to resolve the doubt against the act, not in favor of it."

It is this point, so often forgotten in impatient comments on perfectly sound and just decisions of our courts, which Cooley has put so well in saying that a member of the Legislature may refuse to vote for a bill on the ground of its unconstitutionality, and yet afterwards, when promoted to the bench, be bound to support the same measure, if passed by the Legislature against his vote, as being constitutional; that is to say, not so clearly unconstitutional that he can disregard the decision of the Legislature, the body charged, in the first instance, with the right and duty to act.

As to the construction of these volumes, the main text (874 pages) is divided into fourteen chapters. The formal exposition of the Constitution begins with chapter viii, at page 349. The first seven chapters are made up of an introduction, in which some fundamental principles are worked out and terminology is settled, and of other chapters on the Source of Sovereignty and Power, the Limit of Governmental Powers, the Origin of English Institutions, American Constitutional Development, Two Important Compromises in the Constitution, and The Constitution as Modified by the Civil War. The other chapters deal first with the arrangement and interpretation of the instrument, and then take up in turn the legislative department (nearly three hundred pages), the first ten amendments, the executive department, the judicial department, and limitations on the powers of the States. An appendix of some sixty pages contains a variety of illustrative documents, including the Constitution and the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798. Although the author had not quite completed his work, the editor has preferred to print it as it stood, without undertaking to supply any omissions. Apparently these were not many.

This serious and valuable treatise is published in a worthy style, handsome and solid. In the excellent preface, the editor, who is, we believe, the author's son, as well as successor in his chair at the University, tells us that the author, born in 1823, died in February, 1897, and that systematic work on these volumes only began in the autumn of 1895. "He was the son of Henry St. George Tucker, President of the Court of Appeals of Virginia, and grandson of St. George Tucker, also a member of that court, and who was the author of 'Tucker's Blackstone,' the first commentary on the Constitution of the United States." Students of political science, of constitutional history, and of constitutional law have reason to be grateful to the editor for the pious care and the good judgment with which he has produced these studies of his distinguished father. They contain ample evidence of what the editor impressively says: "The book is an expression of the views of the author—not merely his intellectual opinions, but his deep convictions—in the consistent exercise of which he lived and in the faith of which he died; and neither the dissent of friendship, nor the storm of popular indignation, nor yet the hope of political preferment, ever shook his unswerving devotion to them."

It is proper to mention two or three slight errors. On p. 159 the author says that in England the crown has not exercised the veto power since 1692. Anne exercised it in 1707, in refusing her assent to the Scotch Militia Bill. The important case of Hans *v.* Louisiana, in both the table of cases and the book itself, is disguised as *Ham v.* Louisiana. In citing Cooley on Constitutional Law, we are not told which of his two books is meant, the 'Principles' or the 'Limitations.' It may be added that the author, at p. 803, misconceives the case of Gelpcke *v.* Dubuque; and that here and there, as in the cases of Ableman *v.* Booth, the Dred Scott case, already mentioned, and the Milligan case, he states inexactly the points decided. But it should also be added that these are trifling things to speak of, in so large a work, which the author had no opportunity to revise.

Reminiscences by Justin McCarthy, M.P. Harper & Bros. 1899.

There is no form of literature so much in demand to-day as personal reminiscences, and there are probably few people living so well qualified as Mr. McCarthy, both by his experience and his powers of expression, to meet this demand. Beginning life as a newspaper reporter, he had excellent opportunities of seeing and describing some of the great men of his youth. Then he became editor of the *Morning Star* in the days when it was largely under the personal influence of John Bright and represented the most intelligent liberal opinion of England. Then he blossomed out as a successful littérateur, which implies a passport to all that is most interesting in London society; and, finally, he became an active and influential member of Parliament. Such a career would compel even a retiring person to make many interesting acquaintances, though he might refrain from describing them; in the case of Mr. McCarthy, with a sociable disposition and a passion for celebrities of all kinds, such a career made these good-sized volumes quite inevitable.

The book has the defects of its writer's qualities. This very geniality, this remarkable absence of political bias and personal venom, this fondness for *all* the celebrated men "who have shaken me by the hand," produces a certain monotony of praise that becomes a trifle wearisome. One is reminded of John Bright's theory that in properly constructed novels and plays there should be none but good characters. Possibly he was right in believing that such stories would raise the moral standard of readers, but would it be entirely safe to assume that they would continue to be read? Making due al-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowance, however, for this defect, there remains so much of the charm that invariably attaches to genuine personal recollections of the great that the book is assured of many interested readers.

Mr. McCarthy's earliest recollection of Gladstone dates back to 1854, in which year he was sent to London to report the Budget speech for a Liverpool paper. He was assigned to a seat in a remote corner of the gallery and feared that his mission would prove a failure. Great was his relief, therefore, when he found that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's wonderful powers of voice and elocution enabled him to catch every syllable. Next to his voice, Mr. McCarthy was most impressed by Gladstone's eyes, which, like Goethe's, seemed to have the power of resting on every one in the room at the same time. In later years he, of course, knew Gladstone well, and he says that his face became more and more striking as the years went on, and that it possessed that preëminent quality of distinction that at once compelled the attention of a stranger—a quality, by the way, which he found also in the face of Nathaniel Hawthorne. Of his conversation, Mr. McCarthy says that he had the happy faculty of drawing out the ideas of his company, and that, in spite of his wide range of knowledge and love of speech, he never produced the Johnsonian effect of a schoolmaster haranguing a class.

Mr. McCarthy is a great admirer of Dickens. His admiration shows no sign of having suffered from the reactionary chill that has struck so many of the early votaries, but it breaks out in a new place. He does not, like Andrew Lang, go into fine frenzies over 'Pickwick' or Little Nell, but he admits that he is quite unable to do justice to Dickens's genius for after-dinner speaking. He considers him the very best speaker he has ever heard under these conditions, and he brackets Lowell and Depew in the second place. On the other hand, he is willing to allow that Dickens's readings, while inimitable in their way, were at least a fair subject for criticism. To many who heard those readings, and can recall the intense disappointment and shattered enthusiasm that followed the author's interpretation of his own works, this may seem a very moderate admission; but Mr. McCarthy is so pleased with the recollection of the novelist's handshake that it is perhaps all that could be expected. In connection with Thackeray, Mr. McCarthy revives the old discussion as to whether or not the author was entitled to a place in his own 'Book of Snobs,' and decides in favor of the negative view. But here again his good nature and loyalty to those who were once his friends seem to warp his judgment.

Of so many people does Mr. McCarthy say, "So and so was always described as very disagreeable, but I am bound to say that I found him kind and pleasant"—or words to that effect—that the reader will be apt to wonder what dire offence Charles Kingsley could have committed that he alone is outside the pale. In all this crowded gallery of portraits only his is painted in decidedly unpleasing colors, and what faint praise is thrown in is clearly of the damning variety. Lord John Russell, on the other hand, is one of Mr. McCarthy's heroes, in disregard of the popular opinion that Lord John was selfish and cold-blooded. That he had a saving sense of humor is well known, and nothing could be neater than his reply to Sir Francis Burdett, who had formerly been a Radical agitator, and was expressing his contempt for the cant of patriotism: "Yes," said Lord John, "there is only one thing worse, and that is the recant of patriotism." Mr. McCarthy says that nothing in the nature of a living experience ever carried him so far back in time as hearing Lord John casually mention that he had met in Florence the widow of the Young Pretender. But, after all, this is not as startling as it sounds when we remember that the drunken reprobate who had once been known as "Bonnie Prince Charlie" died in 1788, while his widow lived till 1824. Moreover, in the minds of most readers, the mention of the lady recalls Alfieri rather than the Pretender.

Of Cobden and Bright Mr. McCarthy saw a good deal, and in comparing them he very justly says that, while Cobden believed in democracy as such, Bright's efforts were directed to the accomplishment of certain specific reforms, especially of the suffrage, and that, when these were attained, he virtually became a Conservative. Cobden was disliked in England forty years ago, as such men are disliked in America to-day, because, although he was not a peace-at-any-price man, he thoroughly distrusted a war policy as a means of benefiting mankind, and he had absolutely no sympathy with the spirit of Jingoism. It was this feeling that actuated him when he told Lord Palmerston that he could not take office under him because he had frequently described him as the worst Foreign Minister England had ever had. "But," said Palmerston, "Milner Gibson has often said the very same thing, and he is going to take office." "Yes," replied Cobden blandly, "but then I meant it."

Of the great public speakers of other days, Mr. McCarthy instances Brougham, whom he heard at the banquet of the Social Science Association at Liverpool in 1858, and he describes the curious effect on the company of the sudden appearance on the scene of a very venerable old man, with whom Brougham at once fell into earnest conversation, but who was entirely unknown to the rest. It turned out to be Robert Owen, the philanthropist, then in his eighty-seventh year, who had outlived his generation and seemed like one returned from another world. With many natural disadvantages, Brougham was undoubtedly one of the greatest orators that ever lived. For sheer force of sustained logical argument he was perhaps equalled by Sir George Lewis, who, Mr. McCarthy declares, was the only speaker who ever succeeded in completely changing his opinion in regard to the subject under discussion. No doubt this sort of conversion is very seldom accomplished because the speeches delivered in legislative bodies are apt to be aimed at the public outside.

Mr. McCarthy has paid several visits to this country, and, being a good-natured person, and having been very well received here, he has nothing but pleasant things to say about us—some of which, we hope, are true. We would call attention, however, to one of his statements which is obviously incorrect. He says that greater changes have taken place in the outer aspects of the streets of New York in the last ten years than have taken place in London in the last forty-five years. Possibly this might be true about the comparatively small sections of the two cities that come under the observation of the well-to-do, although the immense changes that have been wrought in London during the longer period by the Embankment, the Holborn Viaduct, and the new avenues leading to Charing Cross seem to make it improbable. But in the last forty-five years great cities have been added to London at every point of the compass, as any one may discover by driving in a hansom from north to south or from east to west; compared with these vast additions, the growth of New York in the last ten years is absolutely insignificant. Of course Mr. McCarthy has known many Americans and tells many American stories—among others, one of Henry Ward Beecher's reading from the pulpit various letters received by him during the previous week. One of these contained the single word "Fool." "Now," said Beecher, "I have known many a man write a letter and then forget to sign it, but I never knew a man sign a letter and then forget to write it."

With characteristic good nature, Mr. McCarthy seeks to rehabilitate certain dubious political reputations, such as those of Prince Napoleon and Lord Randolph Churchill. In the case of the Prince he succeeds in showing that he was a free-trader, that he foresaw the rise of Prussia, that he foretold the result of the American Civil War, and that he was utterly opposed to the Emperor's Mexican enterprise. Moreover, it appears that Cavour had a high opinion of the Prince's statesmanship. Mr. McCarthy's brief in favor of Randolph Churchill rests largely on a story which certainly shows the possession of humor. It appears that a great lady once spoke to him of the fund being raised for the benefit of the wives of distressed Irish landlords, and said that, though she was entirely in sympathy with the movement, she had not subscribed to the fund. "I see," said Churchill, "your sympathy doesn't take that form." But it would require more than a good story to establish Lord Randolph's claim to be a statesman.

We have not space to dwell on Mr. McCarthy's account of George Eliot's Sunday receptions, his description of the continual controversies between Froude and Freeman, his lifelike pictures of Huxley and Tyndall. Suffice it to say that on these and many other topics he is instructive and entertaining, and amiable always.

German Higher Schools: The History, Organization, and Methods of Secondary Education in Germany. By James E. Russell, Ph.D. Longmans, Green & Company. 1899.

Of all species of extravagant waste, there is none more unpardonable than that which permits one nation to remain in ignorance of the clever and successful methods devised in another for gaining important ends. The enormous product, in the way of scholarship, which is brought forth in Germany each year is such a remarkable phenomenon that when any light can be thrown upon its first causes, that light must be received with gratitude by those who wish to see a like brilliant issue in our own country. Mr. Russell's book is very exhaustive; it is the result of a long study of the subject,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, so far as his descriptions can be tested by one's personal observations, it is remarkably accurate and sound. Every one who is actively interested in the improvement of methods of education in this country will give serious study to this volume; we can only say here in general terms that much is accomplished in Germany because much is demanded of the teacher, and of the pupil as well. Education is made a matter of extreme concern in every family; nothing but serious illness is allowed to keep a child away from school for a single day, and no extraneous interests are suffered to interfere with his steady preparation of his daily tasks. With this spirit thoroughly ingrained in the family, it becomes possible for the teacher to ask for and to obtain a very large output of work from the student. It is true that it is not disinterested love of learning on the part of the family which brings about this result; a boy's career depends so absolutely upon his completing each grade of study at the right moment, and with the right degree of success, that the pressure is very strong to see that nothing hinders him upon his way. The obverse of this picture of industry is that there is not enough time for play, and especially not enough consecutive free time for engaging in the regular athletic sports. But it is possible that athletic sports are less essential to the boy's well-being than we have hitherto supposed in Anglo-Saxon countries; it is possible that the English authority on food and feeding is right in thinking them an excrescence that might well be removed, an effort to work off the ill effects of the Anglo-Saxon diet, over-rich in proteids. Without question, the time which the German youth gives to music contributes more to making him a civilized human being than many hours of athletics would do; and if it is a question of enduring health, he is far from falling in the rear of his American competitor.

It should be remembered that "secondary education" has not the same signification in Germany as here; its upper end coincides with the end of the second or third year of our college course, as nearly as comparison can be made. *We* do not associate with the phrase the reading of Sophocles and Æschylus, yet that is covered by it in Germany, and yet the boy finishes this portion of his studies at the age of eighteen, as a general rule. Though there is not at all the same fixed relation between age and advancement in school here as there, it may, nevertheless, be safely assumed that the German boy of eighteen is fully two years ahead of the American in acquirement. And the character of the instruction which he has received, as a means to the producing of a cultivated human being, may be gathered from this bit of description in the book before us:

"I have heard such masters teach Sophocles in a way to make one uncertain which to admire most, the marvellous beauty, depth of emotion, and ethical content of the tragedy, or the artistic power of the teacher in making every scene pulsate with life and every sentence speak straight to the hearts of his students. The ethical, the æsthetic, and the patriotic blend in one."

Without going into detailed questions of methods, which are for the technical educational journals to discuss, we note some random points of interest. Education is compulsory from six to fourteen; it is free from six to nine. The cost of instruction in the gymnasium is from $20 to $30 a year, but there are many bursaries. One-half the expenses of the schools is paid by these tuition fees; the general Government pays only one-sixth of the expenses, but it assumes very complete control of the education furnished. From five to six hours a day are spent in the school-room, and from one to three hours are given to outside study; this latter, however, consists chiefly in working up the exercises of the past day. Instruction goes on with much more effort on the part of the teacher than with us, and what we call the "recitation" is not known either in fact or in name. The modern German teacher has become (thanks to the explicit effort of the Government to this end) a person of much social importance; with the military rank which it is now his privilege and his hope to attain, he has gained a distinguished bearing which differentiates him widely from the traditional German pedagogue. The five or six thousand school-teachers who have become officers of the *Landwehr* have made a complete revolution in the status of the teaching profession: "to have officers of the Reserve in a school is equivalent to saying that there are just so many able disciplinarians, perfect gentlemen, men of high moral character and ambitions in the teaching corps." If the discipline is frequently stern and the teacher apparently unsympathetic, this is not disagreeable to the student; he is himself imbued with the military spirit, and is not averse to having it manifested in the school-room.

The German principle for secondary instruction is that the pupil should not be left to flounder about by himself, but that everything should be made plain to him in the class-room. He is considered to have not yet arrived at the stage of independent study, and time is not to be wasted in beating about the bush. The ability to make an occasional lucky guess is in no wise identical with sustained logical thought. The supervision of pupils is not confined to the school premises, but has to do with their entire life outside of school, nor are parents permitted to have their own way with their children. The schoolmaster is in the possession of professional knowledge, and the whims of over-indulgent parents are not allowed to interfere with his methods of training. The use of tobacco is altogether prohibited in the lower classes, and upper-classmen may not smoke on the street or in public places. In no subject of study have recent reforms been of such marked success as in the modern languages; they are taught, besides, with such scientific method that as great proficiency in Latin can be attained in six years if French is studied first as can otherwise be got in nine. As an indication of the remarkable mastery of foreign tongues that can be secured by good teaching, Mr. Russell relates that he was one day asked to speak to a class of boys in English, and was somewhat afraid that they might not understand him: "Imagine my surprise when, at the teacher's suggestion, six of these boys in turn reproduced in their own words and in almost faultless English the gist of all that I had said to them." This was the result of two years of class instruction in English for four hours a week.

Japan in Transition. By Stafford Ransome. Harper & Brothers.

We can hardly expect literature in the average book about Japan, and this one reads more like a commercial report than the product of a scholar or polished writer. Mr. Ransome is a somewhat narrow-minded civil engineer, whose knowledge of subjects beyond his professional ken seems to be rather limited. His style is colloquial, and his reiteration of pet phrases is rather wearisome. His utter lack of perspective in writing, as a correspondent, on commercial matters aroused the just indignation of honorable merchants at the treaty ports. Now, it is plainly evident that, in expatiating on "The Position and Prospects of Christianity," he is familiar neither with actual figures easily accessible and collected with care and diligence, nor with the native literature or periodical writing. His wild assertion about the "2,000 paid foreign missionaries" in Japan, and his apparently profound ignorance of what Americans in all lines of work have done in Japan, show him as untrustworthy in some parts of his report as his commonplace English is loose and threadbare.

Mr. Ransome is on firmer ground when he talks of what he has touched and known. He sees old Japan passing away. New Japan is hardly as yet born, except in the spirit. He describes with briskness and vigor—hastily, also, as if the whole scene would change in a moment—"the transition Japan, which is passing through its most critical throes just now." One must read this book as a correspondent's news-letter, in which neither background nor perspective is visible. The author, who lived but a few weeks over a year in Japan, has apparently got his ideas wholly from English periodical and other ephemeral literature. He speaks evidently to the club, and to an English public in whose eyes Russia must always be the Satan among the sons of God, his fellow-imps being the missionaries, who are made responsible (p. 233) even for the troubles in Formosa.

The best chapter in the book is that on the new school of the drama. As the Japanese "adopt nothing, but adapt everything," they have borrowed many foreign texts and plots, giving them the proper Japanese background and color, and adapting the words to the native prejudice and palate.

The moral standard is discussed with fairness, the author arguing that, to understand or appreciate an alien civilization, "one must begin by making his mind a blank." He defends with spirit the commercial integrity of the Japanese, or rather explains why the Chinese is reckoned superior, and he sees a steady improvement among the business men in the island empire. In modern industry the weak point is that the educated man devotes himself too exclusively to theory and neglects the practical side. He still fears the ancient traditions, being afraid "to dirty his hands in acquiring the practice." Mr. Ransome thinks the power of the Japanese to compete with the skilled producers of Europe has been greatly exaggerated. Treating of the effect of war on foreign relations, he says there is no deep-rooted hatred of the Chinaman, despite surface contempt for Chinese methods. There is a good sketch of "politics past and present," and, in treating of "strategic geography," the author

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

furnishes a chapter which all military students will welcome. As a colonizing Power Japan never wanted Hawaii, does not want the Philippines now, has more than enough to do in Formosa, and, with the rise of manufactures, with congestion of population in the cities and denudation of the country—compelling large imports of food—she is likely to need all her people at home for generations to come, and has, strictly speaking, no surplus population. As an ally, Japan is just the country, with just the people, which Great Britain needs. Both nations united can keep out of hostilities and compel a coal famine that will stop war. Present-day education is discussed and set forth with intelligence, well selected and arrayed figures, and an excellent map.

This work is presented in attractive type and binding on good paper. The clear and beautiful half-tone illustrations, over fifty in number, show finely the progress made in machinery, manufactures, the navy and army, modern architecture and engineering, while the charm of female grace and beauty and the makers of New Japan, especially in statesmanship, arms, and science, are not forgotten. The four maps are of high value and deserving of great praise.

Ἀτθίς : *Storia della Repubblica Ateniese* dalle Origini alle Reforme di Clistene. By Gaetano De Sanctis. Rome: Tipografia Polyglotta della S. C. de Propaganda Fide. 1898. Pp. vii., 364.

He who undertakes to write the constitutional history of Athens ought to sift carefully the literature which has accumulated on the subject in recent years, especially since the discovery of Aristotle's 'Constitution of Athens.' De Sanctis, however, though a scholar of established reputation, has not taken so serious a view of his duty as an historian. Limiting himself, for the most part, to a few good authorities, he has made free use of their material, often without giving them due credit. As a result of this neglect, the reader is in many instances at a loss to determine whether a given view has originated with the author.

Though the work contains some new features and gives evidence of considerable diligence in research, the soundest passages in it are those which aim at digesting the opinions of others. Such is the greater part of chapters i.-iii., which treat of the formation of the Athenian state and of the regal period. Chapter iv., on the decline of the monarchy and the archonship, is unsatisfactory. From the mere fact that the word "archon" is simpler than the word "polemarch," the author concludes, against the testimony of Aristotle, that the archonship was instituted before the polemarchy. Yet, were we to follow the analogy furnished by the two Athenian councils, we should reach the opposite result, for it is the earlier council which bears the more complex title. Equally slender is the evidence for De Sanctis's opinion that the thesmothetæ were instituted at the same time with the archonship, or at all events before the polemarchy. It seems better to connect the origin of this office with the rise of the timocracy, which belongs apparently to the seventh century B.C. But De Sanctis has no room in his work for the growth of timocracy, though he is aware that Solon did not create that form of government. It seems strange that he should have ignored Busolt's masterly treatment of this subject. Again, disregarding a statement of Aristotle that in early Athens the magistrates were appointed by the Council of the Areopagus, he declares that from the beginning they were elected by the people, and cites Spartan usage as proof. His failure to grasp the truth of this matter, as Aristotle represents it, leads him to misconceive the whole development of the Athenian constitution before Solon. Athens and Sparta did not advance along parallel lines.

The first three sections of Aristotle's 'Constitution of Athens' De Sanctis (chapter v.) considers of no historical value—a tissue of "combinations." But Aristotle's combinations are worthy of consideration; it is not unlikely, too, that he had some slight documentary evidence for the time before Solon. Our author goes with the majority in pronouncing section iv. of the 'Constitution of Athens' a political forgery of some fifth-century oligarch—a crude mixture of the old and the new—which the simple-minded Aristotle accepted as a constitution of Draco and inserted without hesitation in his history, though it was absolutely incongruous with the rest of the work. Blass, who differs from the majority, the author silences with an exclamation, and proceeds to support his own view by misinterpretations and by violent emendations of the text. There is need of greater fairness in the treatment of this unfortunate section.

The title of the seventh chapter, "The First Written Constitution"—that of Solon (594 B. C.)—strikes the reader as very strange. There is a vast difference between a written constitution, as that of the United States, and an unwritten constitution amended by written laws, as that of Athens. The former presupposes an advanced stage of political thought reached in Athens in the latter half of the fifth century B. C. It was not till 411 B. C. that Athens came under a written constitution, and then for only a few months. When the author, p. 193, says that the people, not content with the code of Draco (621 B. C.), demanded a constitution, he ascribes to them a theoretical knowledge of government which even the Greek philosophers did not begin to acquire till nearly two centuries later.

Among the surprises afforded by the book is a new date for the conspiracy of Cylon. Till within recent years, all agreed in placing this event between Draco and Solon (621-594 B. C.); Busolt and Wright made it earlier than Draco, and their view has the support of Aristotle's 'Constitution of Athens.' Now De Sanctis (chapter viii.), following a suggestion of Beloch, declares that it occurred while Pisistratus was in exile (after 560 B. C.). His theory, though interesting, is far-fetched. Connected with this date of Cylon is his opinion (chapter ix.) that Pisistratus instituted the naucraries. In this case, he argues that the term "naucrary" had reference to ship-building, and that Athens had no fleet before Pisistratus. But the derivation of the word is uncertain, and the laws of Solon referring to this institution prove its existence in his time. It is hardly possible, as De Sanctis assumes, that the Atthid-writers should have been deceived as to the authorship of these laws.

On purely subjective grounds, De Sanctis (chapter x.) places the constitutional reforms of Cleisthenes before his struggle with Isagoras, and makes these improvements the cause rather than the effect of the strife, thus setting aside the testimony of Herodotus and of Aristotle. That Cleisthenes, the founder of the democracy, should have ever been the head of the aristocratic party is to him an absurd idea. The test of absurdity, however, is unsafe. To one acquainted with practical politics, a summersault such as that which Herodotus ascribes to Cleisthenes seems too commonplace to raise a suspicion.

In conclusion, it may be said that the tendency of De Sanctis is to cut loose from authority and from the recognized canons of historical criticism, and to give free rein to the fancy. It is to be noted further that his originality lies especially in changing the dates of events. Zealously patterning after Beloch, yet lacking the judgment of his master, he falls far short of the standard set by Busolt, who, in the second edition of his 'Griechische Geschichte,' has contributed greatly to our knowledge of early Attic history.

Siberia and Central Asia. By John W. Bookwalter. Springfield, Ohio.

There is so much that is unfair in many popular ideas about Russia, there are so many people ready to believe anything unfavorable to that country, that something dithyrambic on the subject may be useful every now and then as a corrective. Last year, Mr. J. W. Bookwalter travelled rapidly (making all due allowance for the slowness of Russian trains) through the regions he describes; and the result is a heavy volume containing, besides a large number of not very interesting photographs, an array of descriptions, statistics, and conclusions delivered with a breezy cocksureness that makes the reader feel no time has been wasted. If the chops and steaks at the railway restaurants were juicy, it showed that the region had a splendid future as pasture-land; again and again a few well-handled figures prove great things; and what use would there be in having a guide through whom people could be interviewed, if what they said, especially when officials, were not accepted? Thus the process of acquiring information was speedy—sweeping in great facts as well as small of history, sociology, and anything else.

For instance, speaking of the harmless Khirgiz, the writer says: "I am informed that they are yet the same untamed nomads that, under Mundzuk and his successors, as a mongrel Tartar and Mongol horde, swept with such destructive fury nearly 1,600 years ago through the length and breadth of Europe, holding even Rome in terror for several centuries." Why bother to look up in some stupid book the accuracy of such striking information? Or, for a more domestic detail: "I am also informed that in large cities, like St. Petersburg, where the water is not of the very purest, it is the duty of every householder, during the summer, to place a suitable vessel in front of his house, containing boiled water, for the free use of the passer-by." Mr. Bookwalter appears to have been at least in Moscow, in July, but he does not mention how many such exaggerated cholera regulations he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has himself seen signs of. To counteract common accusations that Russia is a barbarous state, ruled by corrupt and ignorant officials, it is pleasing to hear that

"Within certain limits this is perhaps the most secure and the freest country in the world. . . . There is perhaps no nation whose official classes are so well informed, or who so minutely understand the commercial, industrial, and even the political policies of other nations, and the real working and trend of their institutions. It was, no doubt, this penetrating foresight [the author does not seem to be "informed" in this case] that caused her, long ago, to devise her policy of territorial acquisition, under which she laid aside for future use such vast accessible and contiguous areas of country which to the rest of the world seemed useless."

Even the passport system in "the freest country in the world" finds favor:

"It is, moreover, an instrument that greatly aids in more thoroughly utilizing all its [the Government's] sources of energy, and in knitting more effectively together the potencies of national life into a compact, mobile whole, leaving no loose ends floating about."

A good deal might be said in regard to this statement about a land that has suffered for centuries from the plague of vagrancy, but we do not care to go into the question of Mr. Bookwalter's beliefs, of his faith that every suggested railway will be built at once (which is very different from the usual experience in the empire of the Czar), of his political reflections, reminding one so often of those of the ordinary Russian traveller one meets. His whole attitude is that "tout est pour le mieux dans la meilleure des Russies possible." It is, however, perhaps worth while to call attention to some of the errors of detail in his facts.

The standing army of Russia is very large, but it is not "1,500,000 to 2,000,000 of men," nor could she "quickly put herself on a war footing of four or five millions of men, well appointed and equipped." The assertion that the railway from Kushk is "being quietly extended to Herat," *i. e.*, in Afghan territory, seems so absurd on the face of it that we ask for more proof than the remark in another place that "it is hinted." The road from Petrovsk to Derbent can hardly be "almost completed," as last July people were still talking of beginning it in a year's time. Although the Russians have large families, they are not by any means "probably the most prolific race on the face of the globe." "The famous" Shamyl (not Schemyl) was not "a Georgian chieftain," but a Lesghian, and he "made his last stand in defence of his country" at Ghunib, far away in Daghestan, not near Tiflis. It is incorrect to say of climbing Ararat that "those who visit the summit are provided by the Government, for their protection, with ten or a dozen Cossacks from the barracks located at the foot of the mountain, where there are always quartered several regiments of these celebrated soldiers." Last summer, when a foreigner came to try the ascent, there were only some score of men in these barracks (even in winter there are but a few hundred), and at that time no officer or soldier in the vicinity had ever attempted to get to the top of the mountain. A party of ten infantrymen and three Cossacks served him as a volunteer escort, at the invitation of the officer commanding a summer camp part way up the mountain, and some such courtesy may have become the custom since, if there has been occasion for it this year. The "good road from Kutais to Vladikaykaz," though existing for most of the distance, is in one portion only a bridle-path, impassable for carriages. The way from Abbas Tuman to Kutais is fine enough, but not "one of the wildest and most solitary passes in the world," nor need the precautions against brigands always be elaborate.

So we might go on. In fact, throughout the book there is a general looseness of statement which makes one hesitate to accept without further confirmation anything it says. The author would have done wisely to subject "a work thrown off during the excitement and fatigue of a long journey" to careful correction at greater leisure.

Esek Hopkins, Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Navy, 1775-1778. By Edward Field. Providence. 1898. Portraits.

Mr. Field seeks to defend Hopkins against certain charges of misconduct while commander of the Continental Navy in the first years of the Revolution. This is not an easy task, for many circumstances contributed to bring to pass the discharge of Hopkins under serious charges. There were personal as well as political reasons for the act, and it is much to Mr. Field's credit that he does not suppress what may tell against Hopkins as a man or as a naval officer. A sea-captain of long standing, in the employ of the Browns of Providence, Hopkins certainly knew how to handle a ship. He had the usual faults of a seaman, and they became glaring when he undertook to become a politician. Hasty and intemperate of speech, he did not hesitate to break out against those with whom he had served and to whom he had for years given support. He carried his habits into the "navy," a few small vessels hastily brought together and controlled through the Congress. The local agents of this body were charged by Hopkins with being interested in privateers, of caring more for their personal interests than for those of the continent, and of encouraging malpractices that their gains might be the greater. He was known to have spoken disrespectfully of the Marine Committee of Congress, though he doubtless uttered only the truth, for the committee gave extraordinary orders at extraordinary times, and laid the responsibility of failure on the fleet. He used language more forcible than was necessary, thereby shocking the chaplain of the fleet, who did not hesitate to mention the affair to Congress, urging the demands of his own conscience, while overlooking the dangerous example of insubordination among men much discontented and ready to conspire against their commander. On the other hand, Hopkins enjoyed the warm friendship of John Adams, John Paul Jones, and others not more likely to take up with a sham; and even Knox, himself something of a rough diamond, wrote of him, "Though antiquated in figure, he is shrewd and sensible. I, whom you think not a little enthusiastic, should have taken him for an angel only he swore now and then."

The test came in actual service, and here there was much to create doubt of his real abilities. It is hardly possible that Congress really intended to give Hopkins the same relative command at sea as Washington held on land, but high rank was given, and the fleet was constituted with some flourish. The one expedition that could be considered of any moment was that to New Providence to seize powder and stores. Only partial success was attained, for the greater part of the powder had been shipped away by the English Governor, and Hopkins returned to New London after engaging a British vessel under conditions that would seem to insure his success. Yet he failed, and the months of idleness that followed gave rise to an opinion that Hopkins was not the man for the place, and did prove that he lacked organizing ability. It may be admitted that many conditions favoring success were wanting. The Marine Committee of Congress interfered, ordered him on impossible ventures, and, when disappointed, laid the blame on the Commodore. Money was wanting, and could not be obtained as needed. It was difficult to enlist men, for the higher pay and greater chances of privateering drew into that calling those who might have made a navy. There were jealousies among the officers of the fleet, and discipline was not maintained.

Without money, men, or officers, Hopkins blurted out his opinion of men and things, and this was reported to his superiors. Congress ordered him to appear before it and explain his conduct, but did not accept his explanation as satisfactory. Later, on the complaints of his own officers, he was suspended and dismissed from the Continental service. The charges made were vague, and covered many insinuations that no court would admit to be evidence; yet it cannot be said that Congress was too severe in its judgment. Hopkins, with characteristic temper, court-martialled those who had complained of him, and then sued them for libel in the civil courts—a poor remedy for an injured reputation, and in this case bringing none. It is difficult to accept the opinion of Mr. Field that Hopkins was sacrificed to the spite of men whose influence was very powerful, and whose enmity he had incurred by denouncing their guilty practices. Nor could the prejudice against New England so freely expressed in Congress account for the result. Schuyler was kept down by a prejudice of New England against him, and at this time that prejudice was in the ascendant, controlling Congress in its decisions on the Northern army. How, then, could a general prejudice of an opposite nature accomplish all that Mr. Field attributes to it? There was enough in Hopkins's own acts and character to account fully for what was done, and it is nothing against him to admit it. His habits were those of sea-captains of the time, and the picture of the interior of a public house in Surinam, reproduced in this volume, tells the whole story.

Mr. Field has made an interesting volume, but it could be wished he had printed more of Hopkins's letters.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adams, Oscar F. The Archbishop's Unguarded Moment, and Other Stories. Boston: L. C. Page & Co.

Barron, Elwyn. Manders. A Tale of Paris. Boston: L. C. Page & Co.

Bida, Alexandre. Aucassin and Nicolette. Fords, Howard & Hulbert.

Boothby, Guy. Dr. Nikola's Experiment. Appletons. $1.

Breen, Matthew P. Thirty Years of New York Politics. New York: The Author.

Bridgman, R. L. The Master Idea. Boston: Pilgrim Press.

Bryce, Lloyd. Lady Blanche's Salon. F. T. Neely.

Budge, E. A. W. Oriental Wit and Wisdom; or, The "Laughable Stories." From the Syriac. London: Luzac & Co.

Butler, W. A. Nothing to Wear, and Other Poems. New ed. Harpers. $1.75.

Cadet, Félix. Port Royal Education. Syracuse, N. Y.: C. W. Bardeen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Clark, S. H., and Blanchard, F. M. Practical Public Speaking. Scribners. $1.
Clement, Clara E. Saints in Art. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. $2.
Coe, Rev. E. B. Life Indeed. F. A. Revell Co. $1.25.
Colmore, G. The Strange Story of Hester Wynne. Appletons. $1.
Connell, G. S. The Old Patroon, and Other Plays. W. H. Young & Co. 40c.
Connor, Ralph. Black Rock. A Tale of the Selkirks. F. H. Revell Co. $1.25.
Crawford, Virginia M. Stories in Foreign Literature. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. $1.75.
Curtis, G. W. Prue and I. Harpers.
Cyr, Ellen M. Fifth Reader. Boston: Ginn & Co. 80c.
Dake, C. R. A Strange Discovery. New York: H. I. Kimball. $1.25.
Dawe, Carlton. The Voyage of the "Pulo Way." R. F. Fenno Co. $1.25.
Dewar, G. A. B. Wild Life in Hampshire Highlands. London: Dent; New York: Macmillan. $3.
Dixon, Mary A. The Love Affairs of Margaret Dale. F. T. Neely.
Foa, Edouard. After Big Game in Central Africa. London: A. & C. Black; New York: Macmillan.
Fox, Prof. W., and Thomas, C. W. A Practical Course in Mechanical Drawing. D. Van Nostrand Co. $1.25.
Harraman, Curtis G. American Investments Classified. New York: The Author.
Herford, Prof. C. H. The Works of Shakspere. [Eversley Edition.] Vols. VI. and VII. Macmillan. Each $1.50.
Herrick, Prof. R., and Damon, L. T. Composition and Rhetoric for Schools. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co. $1.
Hillyer, Prof. H. W. Laboratory Manual. Macmillan. 90c.
Hooker, Le Roy. Baldoon. Rand, McNally & Co. $1.25.
Howard, J. R. Patriotic Nuggets. Fords, Howard & Hulbert.
Howard, J. R. Educational Nuggets. Fords, Howard & Hulbert.
Hyslop, Prof. J. H. Logic and Argument. Scribners. 75c.
Jókai, Maurus. Pretty Michal. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. $1.50.
Knackfuss, H. Rembrandt. [Monographs on Artists.] Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Knackfuss, A. Van Dyck. [Monographs on Artists.] Leipzig: Velhagen & Klasing; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Lentz, Max. Heyse's L'Arrabiata. American Book Co.
Major, G. M. Lays of Chinatown, and Other Verses. New York: H. I. Kimball. $1.25.
Pickett, Mrs. Lasalle C. Pickett and his Men. Atlanta, Ga.: Foote & Davies Co.
Read, Capt. G. W. The Hygiene of the Soldier in the Tropics. Kansas City: Hudson-Kimberly Co.
Stephens, R. N. A Gentleman Player. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. $1.50.
Stout, G. F. A Manual of Psychology. London: W. B. Clive; New York: Hinds & Noble.
The Mirror of Perfection. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. 75c.
Thompson, E. S. Lobo, Rag and Vixen. Scribners. 60c.
Warner, G. T. Landmarks in English Industrial History. London: Blackie & Son; New York: Macmillan. $1.60.

Henry Holt & Co.

Atkinson's Elementary Botany

By Prof. GEO. F. ATKINSON of Cornell. Profusely illustrated. xxiii + 444 pp. 12mo, $1.25 *net.*

Nature (London): "This is one of the best little books of its kind it has been our lot to look through for a long time. Pleasantly written, admirably printed and illustrated, it forms an excellent introduction to the study of the science of botany, and Professor Atkinson is to be congratulated on the way in which he has fulfilled the task he has set himself."

Barnes's Plant Life

By Prof. CHAS. R. BARNES of the University of Chicago. With about 400 illustrations. 428 pp. 12mo, $1.12 *net.*

Prof. V. M. Spalding of the University of Michigan: "I am impressed with its comprehensiveness, trustworthiness, clearness, and simplicity of statement, combined with scientific accuracy and a common-sense adaptation to the needs of students for whom it was prepared. Such a book has been greatly needed, and it has at last been written in such a way as to leave nothing to be desired except teachers who know how to use it. It can hardly fail to materially promote the development of the right kind of biological work in the secondary schools. The author seems to me to have attained his own ideal, and greater praise it would be hardly possible to give."

Holden's Elementary Astronomy

By EDWARD S. HOLDEN, sometime Director of Lick Observatory. (*American Science Series.*) About 400 pp. 12mo (*October*).

This book aims to present the most significant results of ages of astronomical observation, so as to give wide general views and at the same time a luminous idea of the most important of the special methods of the science. Being designed for beginners, the topics are treated at length with great clearness.

Kingsley's Vertebrate Zoölogy

By Prof. J. S. KINGSLEY of Tufts College. 417 pp. 8vo.

A new book by the author of "The Elements of Comparative Zoology." It is very fully illustrated, and can be used as a companion to McMurrich's "Invertebrate Morphology."

Martin's The Human Body

Entirely New Edition

of the Briefer Course

Revised, with Practical Exercises by Prof. GEO. W. FITZ, of Harvard. xiv+408 pp. 12mo, $1.20 *net.*

Prof. Henry B. Ward, of the University of Nebraska: "Martin's has always been a most admirable book from a scientific point of view, and the addition of the appendices, particularly that on demonstrations and experiments, will do away with the single objection urged against the book hitherto."

Peabody's Laboratory Exercises

in Anatomy and Physiology

By JAMES E. PEABODY, of the High School for Boys and Girls, New York. x+79 pp. 12mo. Interleaved. 60c. *net.*

Forty-five simple and unobjectionable experiments.

Prof. H. C. Bumpus of Brown: "An exceedingly useful and thoroughly up-to-date manual."

Torrey's Elementary Chemistry

By JOSEPH TORREY, Jr., of Harvard. 437 pp. 12mo, $1.25 *net.*

A systematic course of instruction accompanied by carefully chosen laboratory work, mainly quantitative in character, suitable for well-equipped schools and elementary college classes.

Underwood's Moulds,

Mildews and Mushrooms

A guide to the Systematic Study of Fungi and the Mycetozoa and their Literature. By Prof. LUCIEN M. UNDERWOOD of Columbia. Illustrated with ten Heliotype plates, one colored. 236 pp. 12mo, $1.50 *net.*

The chapters cover the Relations of Fungi to other Plants; Reproduction, Constituents, and Habits; Phycomycetes, Ascomycetes, Fungi Imperfecti, Basidiomycetes, Fungus Allies; the Study of Mycology in general and in America; the Geographic Distribution of American Fungi; Methods of Collection and Preservation—Hints for Further Study.

There are indexes—I. to Latin Names, II. to Host Plants, III. to Authors and Collectors, IV. General Index and Explanation of Terms.

Woodhull & Van Arsdale's

Chemical Experiments

By Prof. JOHN F. WOODHULL and M. B. VAN ARSDALE, both of Teachers' College, New York City. 136 pp. 12mo, 60 cents *net.*

An elementary laboratory manual of the chemistry of every-day life, air, water, combustion, bleaching, alkalies, soaps, etc.

Evans's Algebra for Schools

By GEORGE W. EVANS of the English High School, Boston, Mass. 433 pp. 12mo, $1.12 *net.*

Aside from a number of novelties, the book is distinguished by two notable features: I. Practical problems form the point of departure at each new turn of the subject; II. It contains nearly 3,500 examples, none of which are repeated from other books.

Prof. Paul H. Hanus of Harvard: "The author has certainly been successful in presenting the essentials of elementary Algebra in a thoroughly sensible way as to sequence of topics and method of treatment."

29 WEST 23D ST., NEW YORK, 378 WABASH AVE., CHICAGO.

Story of the Nations.

New Numbers. Fully illustrated. Large 12mo, each $1.50; half leather, each $1.75.

No. 53. **The West Indies.** A History of the Islands of the West Indian Archipelago, together with an Account of their Physical Characteristics, Natural Resources, and Present Condition. By AMOS KIDDER FISKE, A.M.

Nos. 54 and 55. **The Story of the People of England in the 19th Century.** By JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M.P. In two volumes.

No. 56. **The Story of Austria.** The Home of the Hapsburg Dynasty, from 1282 to the Present Day. By SYDNEY WHITMAN.

No. 57. **China.** By R. K. DOUGLAS.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,

27 & 29 W. 23d St., New York.

THE ONLY AUTHENTIC

Life of Dewey

In OUR THREE ADMIRALS:

FARRAGUT, PORTER AND DEWEY

By JAMES E. HOMANS, A.M.

An accurate account of their ancestries, early lives, and public services, and the story of their notable achievements and memorable victories which won for them the highest rank in the U. S. Navy.

With portraits, illustrations, and maps. Cloth, postpaid, $1.00.

JAMES T. WHITE & CO.,

PUBLISHERS,

25 & 7 East 16th St., New York.

IN THE POE CIRCLE.

By JOEL BENTON.

Some Poe memorabilia. An account of the Poe-Chivers Controversy. Some portraits and facsimiles of MS. Poe and Baudelaire.

12mo, cloth, $1.25.

EMERSON AS A POET.

By JOEL BENTON.

Mr. Benton has recently rewritten and revised a former series of Essays and added thereto an article, Emerson's Later Poems. With a Bibliography and a portrait on Japan paper.

12mo, cloth, $1.25.

M. F. MANSFIELD & A. WESSELS,

1135 Broadway, New York.

THE CAMBRIDGE LITERATURE SERIES

UNDER THE EDITORIAL SUPERVISION OF

THOMAS HALL, Jr.,

Harvard University.

Books required for admission to College

Prices, Imperial Paper Covers.

Single Numbers.... 12 cts.
Double Numbers.... 18 cts.
Triple Numbers..... 24 cts.
} The usual discount. All books sent in any quantities, postpaid.

Prices in Levantine.

Single Numbers.... 25 cts.
Double Numbers.... 30 cts.
Triple Numbers..... 40 cts.
} The usual discount. Books not delivered.

CORRESPONDENCE SOLICITED.

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO., - - Publishers, Boston

BOOKS.—All Out-of-print Books supplied, no matter on what subject. Acknowledged the world over as the most expert bookfinders extant. Please state wants. BAKER'S GREAT BOOKSHOP, 14-16 John Bright Street Birmingham, England.

*FREE READING.—UNITARIAN LI*terature and printed sermons sent free by addressing P. O. Box 272, Concord, Mass.

FLINT.

By MAUD WILDER GOODWIN, author of "White Aprons."

"Abounds in bright, almost epigrammatic sayings and sparkling flashes of merriment."—*Detroit Free Press.*

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., Publishers, Boston.

HAKLUYT SOCIETY (*President*, Sir CLEMENTS MARKHAM, K.C.B.).—The first two of the publications for 1899, viz.: **THE EMBASSY OF SIR THOMAS ROE TO INDIA, 1615—19** (2 vols.), edited by WILLIAM FOSTER, are now being distributed to members by Mr. Quaritch.

The annual subscription is one guinea. A new series commences with these volumes.

WILLIAM FOSTER, *Honorary Secretary.*
BORDEAN, HOLLY ROAD, WANSTEAD (England).

BOOKS, SECOND-HAND AND NEW, Standard and Rare. Books bought. Catalogue issued. E. W. JOHNSON, 2 E. 42d St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED